

# LIVING



HEADQUARTERS  
SECOND ANNUAL MEETING  
DECEMBER 26-27, PHILADELPHIA

Autumn, 1939

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE WORK OF THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION.....	65
<i>Aubrey Williams</i>	
THE FAMILY IN THE MACHINE AGE.....	67
<i>Ernest R. Mowrer</i>	
THE FAMILY AND MARRIAGE IN THE UNITED STATES.....	69
<i>From the Encyclical of Pope Pius XII</i>	
BACKGROUND FACTORS IN DIVORCE.....	71
<i>Clarence W. Schroeder</i>	
A COURSE IN HUMAN RELATIONS AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE.....	73
<i>Mary A. Johnson</i>	
THE ASSOCIATION FOR FAMILY LIVING.....	75
<i>Evelyn Millis Duvall</i>	
THREE PIONEERS IN THE STUDY OF SEX.....	76
<i>E. W. Burgess</i>	
FROM THE CONFERENCES: ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS.....	77
Trends in Family Relationships the World Over	
<i>E. A. Ross</i>	
The Family and Mental Ill-Health	
<i>L. Guy Brown</i>	
Marriage Law	
<i>Albert C. Jacobs</i>	
Mental Tests and the Marriage Law	
<i>Ira S. Wile, M.D.</i>	
The Place of the Church in Family Counselling	
<i>Oliver M. Butterfield</i>	
PROGRAM OF THE SECOND ANNUAL MEETING.....	80
NEWS AND NOTES	
National, Regional, State, and Local Conferences .....	82
Meetings and Events.....	83
Personal Notes.....	85
WHAT A WIFE WAS JULIET.....	87
INDEX OF VOLUME I.....	96

LIVING is published quarterly during the months of September, November, February and May at 450 Ahnaip Street, Menasha, Wis., by The National Conference on Family Relations. Application has been made for entry as second class matter at the Post Office at Menasha, Wis.

Membership (which includes \$1.50 for the magazine, LIVING, and full participation in all activities) is \$2.00 per year. Those who wish to join should send their application to: THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY RELATIONS, 1126 E. 59th Street, Chicago, Illinois.

# The Work of the National Youth Administration<sup>1</sup>

By AUBREY WILLIAMS

Administrator, National Youth Administration

IN THIS country today there are more than 4,000,000 young people who are out of school and out of work. Four million youth who are eager, ready, and willing to work! Yet, search as they may, they can't find jobs. And the tragedy of it is that these youth are good workers, as the work of similarly unemployed youth on NYA projects has conclusively proved. They learn readily and quickly. They are energetic and ambitious; and though most of them may be unskilled or completely lacking in previous work experience prior to coming on NYA, within a short time they are able to perform jobs that require a high standard of workmanship. It is not through any fault of laziness or lack of enterprise or initiative, that these youth are now jobless. Given the opportunity, they can produce work of a quantity and of a quality which it is hard for someone who hasn't seen it with his own eyes to believe is possible.

While unemployed, these millions of youth represent almost a total loss to the country. They represent not only a loss of purchasing power but also a loss of man power with which to fill the country's countless public needs. The problem with which we are faced is to give these youth socially useful and constructive work so that they can become assets rather than liabilities to society. The problem is to unite, or to bring together, the country's recognized needs for repair and improvement with the needs of these youth for work which will build up their bodies and provide skills for their hands. The problem is also to give these youth an income, as a result of such constructive work, so that they can play their part as persons who are adding to the purchasing power of the nation, as consumers who are buying food and clothes and other such necessities.

Since 1933, the Federal Government, through the combined efforts of the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, has provided work for nearly 5,000,000 different youth—about equally divided between the two agencies. The NYA figures include more than 1,000,000 young women. The CCC and NYA have paid out in wages to youth nearly one and one-half billion dollars which has created a purchasing power that

has enabled these youth and their families not only to live at a better standard of living but also to buy food from their grocers, clothing from their local merchants, and to pay rent to their landlords, all of whom have in turn used this money to purchase other things. Another billion dollars and more has been paid out for supplies, materials, services, lands, equipment, etc. also increasing the buying power of our nation.

Besides adding greatly to the nation's purchasing power, these NYA and CCC youth have contributed immeasurably to the country's wealth. The CCC, among its many projects, has planted 1,741,000,000 trees, has constructed 104,000 miles of truck trails or minor roads, has erected 71,692 miles of telephone lines, has constructed 40,000 bridges and more than 45,000 buildings, has reduced fire hazards in nearly 2,000,000 acres of land, has improved 3,312,498 acres of forest stands, has constructed approximately 16,000,000 rods of fence, has built 4,700,000 check dams in gullies, and has expended about 9,000,000 man days either fighting fires or on fire prevention and fire pre-suppression activities. All told, the CCC enrollees have assisted in conserving soil resources on 13,000,000 acres of farm and grazing lands. They have helped farmers in all parts of the country to construct terraces, control gullies, plant trees, and do many other kinds of work which aid in soil conservation. These CCC boys have also worked in approximately 1,000 national or state parks and related areas, providing additional camping grounds, building over-night cabins, improving streams for fishing, and constructing horse and foot trails as well as bridges. And, among other activities, they have aided the U. S. Biological Survey in the development of a nation-wide chain of wild life refuges, have built fish hatcheries, and have planted more than 643,000,000 fingerlings and young fish in lakes, ponds and streams. These figures give you some idea of the truly tremendous accomplishments of the CCC and how much these youth have added to the country's resources.

The NYA—in the two years for which we have figures as compared with the CCC's six—has accomplished the following through its construction, goods, workshop and home economics projects. In the two years ending June 30, 1938, the NYA has not only constructed 125 schools and libraries but has also made repairs and

<sup>1</sup> This paper was originally read by Mr. Williams at the ceremonies which inaugurated work on a community center at Lonaconing, Maryland, Saturday, September 30, 1939.

improvements on an additional 4,459. It has constructed 59 gymnasiums and dormitories, and has repaired 233. It also constructed 74 warehouses, courthouses, offices and administration buildings, and has repaired 352.

In adding to the public recreational facilities of the country, NYA youth have built 5,149 athletic fields, baseball fields, and grandstands, and have repaired or improved 12,697. These youth have also laid out 2,412 handball and tennis courts, and have repaired or improved another 2,349. The swimming and wading pools which have been constructed by NYA youth number 103, and the total which have been either repaired or improved number 150.

In the NYA workshops, the youth have built or renovated more than 481,000 different pieces of furniture. They have also repaired approximately 810,000 toys which have either been loaned out or distributed to needy children at Christmas time. In addition, these workshops have salvaged or produced some 25,679 pieces of playground and recreational equipment, 177,344 pieces of mechanical equipment, and over 853,000 articles made of concrete such as concrete blocks for building.

The young women on NYA projects, who constitute about 43 percent of the total enrollment, had to their credit such accomplishments as serving over 31,500,000 lunches to school children, making some 2,500,000 articles for hospital supplies, and producing in sewing rooms nearly 3,200,000 articles of clothing which were distributed to needy families.

Finally, NYA youth have built, repaired or improved nearly 9,500,000 feet of highways and roads, some 3,700,000 feet of road shoulders, approximately 1,860,000 feet of sidewalks and paths, and nearly 250,000 feet of curbs, gutters and guard rails or guard walls. They have also done 8,607 miles of roadside landscaping.

The accomplishments of the thousands of NYA youth who have been employed as clerical workers in under-staffed government offices, as recreational leaders and assistants on public playgrounds, and as orderlies or assistants in such institutions as hospitals and museums cannot be so accurately measured or recorded. Suffice it to say, that the services of these youth have been of vital importance in enlarging and making more adequate the functions of these offices, playgrounds and institutions.

Similarly, NYA students in schools and colleges—and,

all told, nearly 1,000,000 different students have been given work by the NYA since its inception—have been performing valuable work not included in the above figures. They have improved and added an incalculable amount to the country's plant by landscaping school and college grounds; by painting and repairing classrooms, their furniture and other equipment; by fixing up libraries and museums; and by constructing and keeping in good order their laboratory equipment. These students have also assisted professors and instructors in a tremendous amount of research work, the value of which cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Who can tell how much that may mean to the future of this country and of mankind? The results of NYA students research work have been so important that they have been published in such authoritative journals and periodicals as the *American Heart Journal*, the *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, the *American Journal of Physiology*, the *Journal of Applied Physics*, the *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, and the *Journal of Chemical Physics*.

When the Federal Government makes an investment in its youth or in the country's natural resources, some people call it spending. True, it is spending but it is spending which should be chalked up on the credit rather than the debit side of the government's ledger. Surely an educated and well trained youth is more of an asset to this country than an illiterate youth who has never worked or who has been employed only at the simplest forms of manual labor. If the CCC and NYA create such an asset, as they have done in thousands of cases, then we must think of their appropriations as an investment in the country's resources to that extent. Similarly, when the government spends money to conserve or to improve the soil and forests from which the country will later derive revenue in the form of taxes or increased farm and wood products, then again this money should be considered an investment. Too, if schools, libraries or recreational facilities are built, the country obtains certain concrete assets in return for the money spent. The money which the Federal Government has spent on employing millions of jobless youth should not, therefore, be considered as lost and gone forever. It is in every sense of the word a gilt-edged investment. As President Roosevelt said in establishing the National Youth Administration, "The yield on this investment should be high."

# The Family in the Machine Age

By ERNEST R. MOWRER

Department of Sociology, Northwestern University

THE most striking aspect of the American family before the advent of the machine was its patriarchal form. The husband and father was in every respect the head of the household. Children deferred to the wishes of their elders, and wives were expected to cater to the wants of their husbands. The husband and father had control of all property—the personal belongings of his wife, anything she might earn, the earnings of the children—with all of which he could do as he pleased. Though he might be ever so lenient as an autocrat, there was never any doubt but that final authority was his.

Marriages occurred early and were often arranged by the parents. Courtship could not begin without parental consent. Betrothal was celebrated by a public ceremony, and publication of the banns was required before marriage. Persistently repeated was the advice of the elders: "Where passion and affection sway, that man is deprived of sense and understanding." The result was that romance played little part in the selection of mates, and mercenary marriages were quite common among all classes.

One of the great changes affecting the family in the machine age is the decline in the control of the community and of the neighborhood. In the rural community of the past generation, where the effect of the machine had not been great, everybody knew everybody else. There was little which one did that was not the subject of comment and speculation on the part of the members of the community. To take too lightly the conventions and customs of the group was to be ostracized and to lose caste. Husband and wife might quarrel, but to break off marriage relations one had to take into account the arbitrary censure of the gossip.

In the modern city the situation is quite different. Relations tend to become casual and specialized. Association is upon the basis, primarily, of specialized interests where but one phase of the personality is known. The individual is no longer a part of a few groups, but belongs to many. None of these knows him intimately and so does not attempt to control his behavior in marriage relations, or if it does, he can discontinue contacts with that group. The result is that under urban conditions the individual is freed from the restraints of the neighborhood and of the community, and is free to do much as he pleases in every phase of social life, including, of course, marriage

and the family. And it is the city which has been most influenced by the machine!

One of the first consequences of the mechanization of life upon the family, which is readily apparent, is the extent to which divorce threatens family stability. The divorce rate has increased consistently in the United States throughout the period for which we have reliable data. In 1887 there were 5.8 divorces to each 100 marriages. By 1916 this number had approximately doubled. In 1931, the divorce rate reached a peak of 17.3 divorces to each 100 marriages. And while the rate declined to a somewhat lower figure in 1933, thereafter it went up again to 17.5 divorces per 100 marriages in 1937. The indications are, therefore, that the old trend has been re-established and that the divorce rate will reach the ratio of one divorce per two marriages sometime in the decade, 1970-80.

The divorce rate, however, is not constant throughout the United States. In fact it is those areas most affected by the machine which have the highest divorce rates. In the ninety most rural counties in the nine states in which are located the ten largest cities, the rural and urban rates of divorce were approximately the same from 1887 to shortly before the outbreak of the World War. Since that time, however, the urban rate has become twice as great as the rural, though the latter also has shown a consistent growth. But when we analyze more carefully an urban situation like Chicago we find as great a variance in the divorce rate between different sections of the city as between states in the Union, excepting Nevada. Thus in some of the seventy-five communities in Chicago there is scarcely a single divorce from year to year, whereas in one community the divorce rate reached 68 per 10,000 population in 1930—a rate four and a half times that for the United States as a whole.

Increase in the disorganization of the family with its varying intensities is only one of the consequences of the machine. There has also been a radical change in the functions of the family. It is customary to distinguish between the economic, the educational, the recreational, the protective, the religious, and the affectional functions. In each of these there has been a consistent decline during the machine age, except for the affectional.

The household as a productive unit is almost everywhere a thing of the past. The spinning and weaving of cloth from which to make clothes has long since been

transferred to the factory. The making of clothing in the home has all but disappeared. Much of the laundrying is done by large commercial establishments. Even the preparation of food has been largely taken from the home through the development of hotel living-and-dining and the widespread serving of foods partially prepared before they reach the housewife's kitchen.

When it comes to the educational, recreational, protective, and religious functions, the change is quite as radical. The family takes little or no responsibility for the education of the child after he starts to school at six. In the upper and middle classes this function is delegated even earlier to various so-called pre-school institutions. Recreation has in large part been commercialized, and, except for an occasional outing or party, is no longer a family affair. In the same way the church and the Sunday school have taken over the religious function.

As the family has lost its other functions, however, the affectional has become more and more important. The family provides one with that intimate feeling of appreciation and sympathetic responsiveness to one's moods which seems to be the natural craving of most human beings. Life's disappointments become all the more keen without it, and pleasures lose much of their glow where this intimate responsiveness is lacking. The success of the family is judged by the individual in terms of how well it satisfies this function. But because so much emphasis is placed upon mutual satisfaction of the desire for affection, the attainment of which calls for a continuous process of readjustment, an increased strain is placed upon the family relationship, and its continued existence becomes more precarious than when it performed a larger number of functions.

Closely related to the desire for affection, is the emotional expression which is possible in the family. The emotions have no place in business. Contacts with friends and acquaintances tend to be perfunctory and formal. Social affairs are governed by etiquette. Spontaneity gives way to stereotyped reactions and conventional *blasé*ness. The result is to make the family all the more important as the setting for emotional expression, where the formal requirements of business and social intercourse may be dropped, and the individual can find release for the pent-up emotions occasioned by his living in a machine world. This release, however, may give rise to misunderstandings and conflict within the family itself if one member becomes the scapegoat upon whom are projected the failures and disappointments of another.

Social change growing out of the expansion in the use of the machine, however, has not had a uniform influence upon the family. In the city one can see not only succeeding stages of change in family life, but a prophecy of what is to come. This is particularly true with reference to the family pattern, of which four types may be differ-

entiated: the paternal, the maternal, the equalitarian, and the filiocentric.

The paternal family pattern is characterized by the dominant role of the father and the subordination of the mother and children. This is the family pattern of the proletariat and of the immigrant. Contacts with the community are through the husband and father; he is the head of the house! Within the family circle the father stands for discipline, whereas the mother stands for affection. The father earns the living and determines the patterns of spending. The interests of the wife and mother are limited to the affairs of the home and the care of the children. This type of family pattern has persisted in spite of the machine, though it is rapidly disappearing as the immigrant is assimilated and the proletariat imitates the middle-class.

The assumption of the dominant role by the mother characterizes the maternal family, and is typically suburban and middle-class. Absence of the father from home the greater part of the day causes most of the responsibilities of representing the family to devolve upon the mother. She is the family manager, overseeing and directing all its activities.

The equalitarian family pattern is characterized by the tendency for each member to be on an equal plane with one another. These families tend to be small, and activities outside the home absorb much of the time of each of the members. In the emancipated variation of this pattern, the wife has her own vocational interests, and neighborhood contacts are few. Interest, rather than geography determines group participation. As this pattern becomes conventionalized in middle-class residential districts, the wife spends much of her time in social affairs, philanthropic activities, intellectual and artistic pursuits. The care of the children while they are young is largely delegated to nursemaids, child specialists, and the like.

In the filiocentric family the child plays the predominant role. Where there is more than one child, they may all dominate the family scene, but more likely one child becomes the center of attention and interest. All the activities of the family are determined by this child, either in response to his expressed wishes, or as projections of family aspirations into his personality and development.

In some quarters the development of the filiocentric family is looked upon with alarm since it tends to make the child domineering, and determined to have his own way at all costs. Whether this family pattern represents a prophecy of the trend of change under machine conditions, or only one of the growing-pains of readjustments, is difficult to determine at this time. Certainly it is true that the mechanization of living in the city requires many readjustments of the family before it can become suitable

(Continued on page 86)

# The Family and Marriage in the United States

From the Encyclical of Pope Pius XII<sup>1</sup>

THIS, according to the admission of all reasonable men, is everywhere the bitter and prolific root of evils: the refusal to recognize the divine majesty, the neglect of the moral law whose origin is from heaven, or that regrettable inconstancy which makes its victims waver between the lawful and the forbidden, between justice and iniquity.

Thence arise immoderate and blind egoism, the thirst for pleasure, the vice of drunkenness, immodest and costly styles in dress, the prevalence of crime even among minors, the lust for power, neglect of the poor, base craving for ill-gotten wealth, the flight from the land, levity in entering into marriage, divorce, the break-up of the family, the cooling of mutual affection between parents and children, birth control, the enfeeblement of the race, the weakening of respect for authority or obsequiousness or rebellion, neglect of duty toward one's country and toward mankind.

"We raise our voice in strong, albeit paternal, complaint that in so many schools of your land Christ is often despised or ignored, the explanation of the universe and mankind is forced within the narrow limits of materialism or of rationalism, and new educational systems are sought after which cannot but produce a sorrowful harvest in the intellectual and moral life of the nation.

Likewise, just as home life, when the law of Christ is observed, flowers in true felicity, so, when the Gospel is cast aside, does it perish miserably and become desolated by vice: "He that seeketh the law shall be filled with it: and he that dealeth deceitfully shall meet with a stumbling block therein." [Ecclesiastics 32, 19.]

What can there be on earth more serene and joyful than the Christian family? Taking its origin at the altar of the Lord, where love has been proclaimed a holy and indissoluble bond, the Christian family in the same love, nourished by supernal grace, is consolidated and receives increase. There is "marriage honorable in all and the nuptial bed undefiled" [cf. Hebrews 13, 4]; Tranquil walls resound with no quarreling voices nor do they witness the secret martyrdom which comes when hidden infidelity is laid bare; unquestioning trust

turns aside the slings of suspicion; sorrow is assuaged and joy is heightened by mutual affection.

Within those sacred precincts children are considered not heavy burdens but sweet pledges of love; no reprehensible motive of convenience, no seeking after sterile pleasure bring about the frustration of the gift of life nor cause to fall into disuse the sweet names of brother and sister.

With what solicitude do the parents take care that the children not only grow in physical vigor, but also that, following in the footsteps of their forbears whose memory is often recalled to them, they may shine with the light which profession of the pure faith and moral goodness impart to them. Moved by the numerous benefits received, such children consider it their paramount duty to honor their parents, to be attentive to their desires, to be the staff of their old age, to rejoice their gray hairs with an affection which, unquenched by death, will be made more glorious and more complete in the mansion of heaven.

The members of the Christian family, neither querulous in adversity nor ungrateful in prosperity, are ever filled with confidence in God, to whose sway they yield willing obedience, in whose will they acquiesce and upon whose help they wait not in vain.

That the family may be established and maintained according to the wise teachings of the gospel, therefore the faithful should be frequently exhorted by those who have the directive and teaching functions in the churches, and these are to strive with unremitting care to present to the Lord a perfect people. For the same reason it is also supremely necessary to see to it that the dogma of the unity and indissolubility of matrimony is known in all its religious importance and sacredly respected by those who are to marry.

That this capital point of Catholic doctrine is of great value for the solidity of the family structure, for the progress and prosperity of civil society, for the healthy life of the people and for civilization that its light may not be false is a fact recognized even by no small number of men who though estranged from the faith are entitled to respect for their political acumen.

Oh! If only your country had come to know from the experience of others rather than from examples at home of the accumulation of ills which derive from the plague of divorce! Let reverence for religion, let fidelity toward

<sup>1</sup> The sections of the Encyclical to the Church Hierarchy in the United States dealing with the family and marriage are reprinted here for their permanent value for reference. The encyclical was issued November 11, 1939 on the occasion of the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the United States of America.

the great American people counsel energetic action that this disease, alas so widespread, may be cured by extirpation.

The consequences of this evil have been thus described by Pope Leo XIII in words whose truth is incisive: "Because of divorce, the nuptial contract becomes subject to fickle whim; affection is weakened; pernicious incentives are given to conjugal infidelity; the care and education of offspring are harmed; easy opportunity is afforded for the breaking up of homes; the seeds of discord are sown among families; the dignity of woman is lessened and brought down and she runs the risk of being deserted after she has served her husband as an instrument of pleasure.

"And since it is true that for the ruination of the family and the undermining of the State nothing is so powerful as the corruption of morals, it is easy to see that divorce is of the greatest harm to the prosperity of families and of States." [Encyclical Letter *Arcanum*.]

With regard to those marriages in which one or the other party does not accept the Catholic teaching or has not been baptized, we are certain that you observe exactly the prescriptions of the code of canon law. Such marriages, in fact, as is clear to you from wide experience, are rarely happy and usually occasion grave loss to the Catholic church.

A very efficacious means for driving out such grave evils is that individual Catholics receive a thorough training in the divine truths and that the people be shown clearly the road which leads to salvation. Therefore we exhort the priests to provide that their own knowledge of things divine and human be wide and deep; that they be not content with the intellectual knowledge acquired in youth; that they examine with careful scrutiny the law of the Lord whose oracles are purer than silver; that they continually relish and enjoy the chaste charms of sacred Scripture; that with the passing of the years they study more deeply the history of the church, its dogmas, its sacraments, its laws, its scripture, its liturgy, its language, so that they may advance in grace, in culture and wisdom.

Let them cultivate also the study of letters and of the profane sciences, especially those which are more closely connected with religion in order that they may be able

to impart with clarity and eloquence the teaching of grace and salvation which is capable of bending even learned intellects to the light burden and yoke of the Gospel of Christ. . . .

God, who provides for all with counsels of supreme bounty, has ordained that for the exercise of virtues and for the testing of one's worth there be in the world rich and poor; but He does not wish that some have exaggerated riches while others are in such straits that they lack the bare necessities of life.

But a kindly mother of virtue is honest poverty which gains its living by daily labor in accordance with the scriptural saying: "Give me not, O God, mendicancy or opulence but provide me only with what is necessary for my sustenance." [Proverbs 30, 8.]

Now if the rich and the prosperous are obliged out of ordinary motives of pity to act generously toward the poor their obligation is all the greater to do them justice. The salaries of the workers, as is just, are to be such that they are sufficient to maintain them and their families. Solemn are the words of our predecessor, Pius XI, on this question: "Every effort must therefore be made that fathers of families receive a wage sufficient to meet adequately normal domestic needs. If under present circumstances this is not always feasible, social justice demands that reforms be introduced without delay which will guarantee such a wage to every adult working man. In this connection we praise those who have most prudently and usefully attempted various methods by which an increased wage is paid in view of increased family burdens and special provision made for special needs." [Encyclical Letter *Quadragesimo Anno*.]

May it also be brought about that each and every able-bodied man may receive an equal opportunity for work in order to earn the daily bread for himself and his own. We deeply lament the lot of those—and their number in the United States is large indeed—who, though robust, capable and willing, cannot have the work for which they are anxiously searching.

May the wisdom of the governing powers, a far seeing generosity on the part of the employers, together with the speedy re-establishment of more favorable conditions, effect the realization of these reasonable hopes to the advantage of all.

# Background Factors in Divorce

By CLARENCE W. SCHROEDER

Bradley Polytechnic Institute

IN A recent study of divorce in Peoria, Illinois, a city in 1930 of slightly more than 100,000 population, an attempt was made to study the characteristics of the background of a group of divorced persons. Clues were sought as to causes for divorce. Four hundred divorced persons answered questionnaires which brought out background factors. This divorced group was compared with a similar one apparently adjusted in their marriage relationships. Essentially the same questions were asked of the two contrasting groups. There was an attempt to hold the occupations constant. That is, as nearly as possible the same number of salesmen, plumbers, lawyers, teachers, mechanics, etc. were questioned in each of the groups. Moreover, by selecting them from the same sections of the city, the divorced and control groups came from essentially the same economic and social strata. The length of time that the marriage relationship had existed was also practically the same for the two groups.

There were more women than men who cooperated in filling out the schedule, the exact number of the former being 473 and the number of men, 343. The proportion as between men and women remained approximately the same in each of the groups.

It was found, in the first place, that a larger number of the control group sought the sanction of the church in their marriage. Only twenty of 325 answering the question in the group apparently adjusted in their marriage relationship were married by a judge or a Justice of the Peace, while the corresponding number in the divorced group was 167.

Both groups were asked as to whether they were in the process of buying or planning to buy a home. In so far as the answers show results, they tend to confirm the hypothesis which formed the basis for the question, that is, that there is a relationship between non-home ownership and divorce.

It seems significant that of the 408 of the divorced group who answered the question as to the marital status of their parents 117 or 28.68 percent had parents who were divorced, though 291 came from homes which were not thus broken. As a matter of comparison, only 25 or 7.08 percent of the 353 who answered the question in the control group had parents who were either unhappy or very unhappy in their marriage relation. On the other hand, 328 of the 353 or 93 percent were declared either happy, very happy, or medium happy, and of these

the smallest group, 76 were only medium happy.

All of the studies of which the present writer is aware tend to show a positive correlation between formal education and marital adjustment. Burgess and Cottrell recently concluded that "the higher the educational level at the time of marriage the greater the chances are that the marriage adjustment score will be high."<sup>1</sup> The study in Peoria tends to confirm this conclusion. The control group completed, as an average, almost two years more of formal schooling than did the divorced group.

The question of whether married persons have similar or different interests is one of the most significant factors studied. So important does this seem to be that it may be said with some assurance that the mutual interests and the assessment of them as a welding influence is the supreme purpose of courtship. Both the divorced and the control groups were asked whether all, some, a few, or none of their interests were the same as that of the spouse. The complete results are presented in Table I.

TABLE I  
NUMBER IN DIVORCED AND CONTROL GROUPS HAVING THE SAME  
OR SIMILAR INTERESTS AS HUSBAND OR WIFE

Interests the Same	Divorced Group	Control Group
All interests the same.....	32	129
Some of them.....	196	201
A few of them.....	129	15
None of them.....	50	4
Totals.....	407	349

The matter of church attendance seems to be an important factor in marital relationships. Several questions were answered both by the divorced and the control groups with reference to church affiliation, church attendance, and church activities engaged in. Church attendance during the period of marriage is typical of all the answers secured. There were 133 in the divorced group who never attended, while the corresponding number in the control group was only 48. On the whole the figures reveal that the control group attended church services both before and after marriage and remained in

<sup>1</sup> "Prediction of 'Adjustment in Marriage,'" *American Sociological Review*, 1, No. 5, (October, 1936), 747; See also E. W. Burgess and L. S. Cottrell, *Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage*. New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1939, pp. 121-122.

attendance in Sunday school in larger proportions than the divorced group.

It has been recognized that divorce is an urban phenomenon. This is borne out by this study. The question was asked of divorced and control groups as to whether they spent their childhood in a city, a small town, or the country. The answers are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF DIVORCED AND CONTROL GROUPS AS TO WHETHER CHILDHOOD WAS SPENT IN CITY, SMALL TOWN OR COUNTRY

	Divorced Group	Control Group
City.....	195	167
Small town.....	103	131
Country.....	27	50
Totals.....	325	348*

\* The difference between the proportion of city people in the divorced and control groups is 3.2 times its standard error; hence significant.

In answer to the question, "were you given instructions concerning married life before your marriage," 79 of the divorced group answered "yes" while 131 of the control group were given such instructions. Conversely 290 of the divorced group declared they had had no teaching in regard to marriage relations whereas the corresponding number in the control group was 218. The difference in the latter figures probably is not large enough to be significant. There is too much chance for error in all the figures, so that care is to be exercised in drawing conclusions, especially when the difference between the figures is not large. There are some, however, who will see in these facts an important differential factor, but perhaps most significant is the preponderant number in each group who lacked any instruction upon the assumption of such an important relationship.

The question concerning sex instruction was stated thus: "Sex instruction: by whom: mother, father, teacher, books, magazines, friend or friends, gang." There were 576 responses given by the divorced group and 439 in the control group, indicating that some had received instruction from more than one source. The important differences in the answers of the two groups on this question lies in the preponderance of those in the control group who had received instruction on the subject from their mothers, the difference on this point being 2.92 times the standard error, and in the comparative preponderance of those in the divorced group who had received their sex instruction from a "gang." The difference is 3.46 times the standard error, showing a definite significance in the variations between the two groups on these points. Tabulation of the replies is given below.

There was employed in the questionnaire a cross ref-

TABLE 3  
DIVORCED AND CONTROL GROUPS COMPARED AS TO SOURCE OF SEX INSTRUCTION

Sex Instruction Given by	Divorced Group	Control Group
Mother.....	121	138
Father.....	49	44
Other relative.....	5	20
Teacher.....	7	14
Books.....	70	87
Magazines.....	38	14
Friend or friends.....	170	103
Gang.....	116	19
Totals.....	576	439

erence checking device which was intended to allow the most complete and easiest expression of the condition which existed in the relationship between the wife and husband with reference to nine pertinent items. These were the handling of family finances, matters of recreation, religious matters, the question of demonstration of affection, friends, table manner, relatives (kin), the question of the care of the babies, and ways of dealing with the in-laws. On each of these items the person answering could check any one of six possibilities from "always agreed" to "always disagreed" with four intermediate degrees of agreement or disagreement. The most striking results obtained are recorded in the two extreme columns. The divorced group declared that they agreed always on all the items only 664 times, while the corresponding number for the control group is 1392.

In general the tabulations of the control group leaned heavily over to the side "always agreed," while the divorced group tended as heavily toward "always disagreed"; revealing quite clearly that differences in cultural background form a hazard to marital success.

It is not intended either by the order in which they are presented or by the amount of space given to each to imply the relative importance of the factors presented. The natures of the persons involved and the elements of the situation are so variable and complex that in a given case any one of the factors might be found to be the significant one. More often, perhaps, a combination of several of the factors will be involved.

In summary it may be said that similarity of cultural background is desirable in those who wish to make permanent their marriage relationships. This would particularly manifest itself in similarity, though not identity, of interests. To have some of the same interests seems to be more important than the question of what those interests are, though activity in church affairs seems definitely to make for marital success. Pursuit of education, and particularly some adequacy of instruction in the subject of sex, seems to be a factor making for marital stability.

# A Course in Human Relations at Brooklyn College

By MARY A. JOHNSON

Brooklyn College

BROOKLYN College which is part of the College of the City of New York is a coordinate college. In its administrative set-up the Women's Division is presided over by a dean who has on her staff young women trained in Guidance and Personnel. I joined the dean's staff three years ago, and among my duties was assigned the task of building up a series of discussion groups on Human Relations. The reason for this assignment was that the dean, in her many years of experience in guidance, had learned that many of the problems which students brought to her were based upon a lack of adjustment in their relationships to family life, social life, or school life.

In the Spring of 1936, the women students of the junior class were invited to attend an opening meeting at which I gave them a brief survey of what I planned to do in this field; they were then invited to sign up for this work. The response upon the part of the student body was more than had been anticipated and the enrollment for that semester was four hundred and ninety-three students.

The discussion groups are purely voluntary and carry no credit. They run for a period of sixteen weeks, meeting for one hour a week. Individual and group requests from members of the other classes soon made it evident that hereafter such a series of discussions should be made available to members of all classes. The junior class was chosen because some form of group guidance was already being given to the other three classes. At the present time the discussion groups are open to all women students above the freshman class. (The freshman class is sufficiently guided through its orientation program.)

At first much of the work in these discussion groups was handicapped by the amount of publicity given it by the various newspapers and magazines with its corresponding influx of reporters and photographers. By freely answering questions, their persistence soon died down and since then the work has gone on without much interruption from outside sources.

*Content of Course.* These discussion groups have as their chief aim an attempt to bring to students a picture of human relations from the sociological and psychological point of view.<sup>1</sup> They start out with a brief survey of

the history of the family and its changes. Throughout the series, I attempt to keep in mind the *normal* or, perhaps I should say, the average family and to show the students that from birth to death the individual is a member of a family,—first as a child; later as a parent. A topic of keen interest to our women students is a discussion of their place in their own family. It is interesting to note how alive these women are to the home problems and how eager they are to help in their adjustment. The Armenian girl whose father believes it is a disgrace for her to work as a waitress although she knows that it is a difficult struggle for him to send her to college, is trying to find a way of adjusting his point of view to the American one with as little conflict as possible. Then again there is Esther who brings a problem to the group, which while not her own, is nevertheless very close to her—the conflict in which her brother finds himself because he is unable to accept the orthodox religion of his parents and yet cannot bear the thought of complete ostracism by his family.

Much of the time is spent in discussion of the girls' adjustment to the opposite sex. The ages of this group of college students range between 17 and 21—crucial years in the life of a young woman. It is difficult to discuss the adjustment of a young woman to the opposite sex without discussing her own psychological reactions, and so time is spent in a study of how a young woman may improve herself from a physical, mental, and emotional point of view. Here there is also need for a discussion of mores and the social significance of a young woman's behavior. In the discussion of the opposite sex, I can assume that every young woman is interested in meeting young men with the hope of marriage in the not too distant future. This is in keeping with the conclusions of authorities in this field, and is a long cry from the old theory that college women are more interested in a career than in marriage. Another topic of keen interest is that of the importance of religion to a young couple and the family. In a city college which draws its student population from all nations and all creeds it is very interesting to note the reactions of the student body. A problem closely linked with this one which, however, may be more peculiar to

<sup>1</sup> The outline of the course and suggested reference list are distributed at the first lecture and most of the books are available to the stu-

dents from a private library in my office. These books may be taken out for a period of several days.

this type of institution than to the average college because of the fact that a large part of our student body is Jewish, is the conflict between parents brought up in the old orthodox manner and their children who have broken away from tradition. Naturally this causes much conflict in the home and becomes of especial importance when the young woman is contemplating marriage and is not certain of the importance of religion in her future life.

Today with young people finding difficulty in obtaining jobs, and with salaries inadequate for living, a topic of great interest is the one on "The Role of Woman: Marriage and a Career." This topic always arouses a great deal of discussion and it is interesting to note that our young women are not averse to contributing to the support of the home. The average student seems to plan to combine marriage with a career and often even considers being the sole support of her husband and herself while he completes his professional training. At the same time most of the girls look forward to the day when they no longer have to work but may devote their whole time to family life.

Of course as is natural in a discussion of this type, the question of petting is brought up. On the whole, however, our students have developed their own philosophy about this subject and the question usually resolves itself into a pro and con discussion with no attempt to formulate any definite behavior.

*Evaluation of Course.* As those who have been working in this field realize, it is difficult to make any statistical evaluation of this type of work. This is not like the case of a disease for which one may quote statistics to prove the value of preventive measures. At the same time I am encouraged to continue with this work because I feel that a subject that attracts members of an overworked student body, and which does not give them any college credit must be filling a need in their lives. Furthermore, all students in these discussion groups have the privilege of coming to the teacher either individually or in small groups for further help and most of them do come. Finally, a return of these students after completion of these discussions—in several instances with their fiancés—has encouraged me further. Beginning this fall, the college physicians have advised several girls to attend these groups and several of the sororities have done likewise.

*Present Status of This Work.* Since the first semester when the enrollment was of unusual size because of the newness of the idea, no attempt has been made to publicize these discussion groups other than to place a small notice in the college newspaper shortly after the semester

begins, announcing the dates of enrollment for these groups. The enrollment each semester has averaged between seventy-five and one hundred. This has been divided into three or four groups making for more freedom of discussion and better rapport between the teacher and students.

Much could be added, for this field, while new, is a challenging one. True, the number of women reached by this work at present is very small as compared with the total female population, but with so many other colleges working in this same field and such organizations as the Y.W.C.A., Y.M.C.A., and Jewish Community Centers aiding those who are not of the privileged college class, the writer looks forward to a generation which, already facing a difficult world bravely, will also face these problems, and make every effort to cope with them objectively and with intelligence.

#### *Outline for Study*

I. *The Family:* history of the family, modern trends in respect to the family, the family as a builder of personality, the family as a training agency, the family as an initial cultural influence, and the family and the depression.

II. *Choosing a Mate:* finding a mate, matching of individual characteristics, emotional adjustments, personality and its connotations.

III. *The Psychology of the Courtship Period:* length of courtship, its meaning and its problems, the psychology of sex appeal.

IV. *Engagement, Wedding and Honeymoon:* length, cost and purpose of each, marriage of yesterday as compared with that of today.

V. *Sex Adjustment in Marriage:* sex differences, importance of medical advice.

VI. *Domestic and Economic Adjustment:* inadequate preparation, adjustment to reality, income, budget-making, saving, installment buying.

VII. *Religion and the Family:* the family as a coordinating factor, problem of mixed marriages, influence on children.

VIII. *The New Family:* types of new adjustments necessary, problems of parenthood, new adjustments in family budget.

IX. *Federal or State Subsidy of Marriage:* discussion of possibilities, what has already been suggested.

X. *The Role of Woman: Marriage and Career:* compensations for remaining single, necessary adjustments if both are to be obtained, problem of the double income.

# The Association for Family Living

By EVELYN MILLIS DUVALL

*Executive Director, The Association for Family Living*

IT IS interesting to observe that at the time when people are trained for all the arts and skills and crafts from beauty culture to organic chemistry, education for family living is just coming into its own. The demand of hundreds of thousands of parents for help in the problems of guidance of their children and youth, of young people themselves for pre-marital and pre-parental training, has been responsible for the rapid development of the Association for Family Living with headquarters in Chicago.

At the present time the Association for Family Living functions throughout Chicago and the Middle West in an informal program of education for family living through community-wide institutes, conferences, and courses, and as a resource in child guidance and personality development and adjustment for many agencies and educational institutions. It works with three types of need based on the request of individuals and groups:

1. A growing multitude of parents in settlement houses, churches, community study groups, schools, etc., who grow toward an understanding of themselves in relationship to their developing children.
2. A cosmopolitan cross-section of youth groups, clubs in Y.W.C.A.s and Y.M.C.A.s, students in high schools, colleges, and professional training schools, industrial workers, business girls, etc., who ask for guidance in boy-girl relationships, getting along with the family, and problems of modern courtship and marriage.
3. The third group is made up of professional persons, teachers, principals, house mothers of orphanages, girl scout and Y.W. and Y.M. staff members, etc., who meet with members of the Association staff to evaluate their programs and methods in terms of human need.

Stated simply, the Association for Family Living is a resource agency in human development and personal adjustment for the community. Its method is primarily that of working with groups of people with similar interests and mutual problems under the direction of a skilled professional group leader. Small groups of parents meeting frequently together throughout the year gain the support of the group in the consideration of common concerns at the same time that they are helped to emotionally accept and intellectually understand their children, their marriage partners, and themselves. Similarly, young people,

through meeting in informal groups, gain the perspective of the larger social aspect of their personal problems and so are helped to a feeling of adequacy that makes constructive adjustment possible.

Individual consultation under the direction of the professional staff working closely with the staff psychiatrist and psychiatric social workers is available for all members of groups and individual members of the Association. It provides an opportunity to discuss individually problems of everyday family living, and deals preventively with problems before they become too deeply rooted.

The Association for Family Living is unique in the close-working relationship between the staff and the membership. The staff is responsible for all individual consultation and the leadership of all groups. Regular staff meetings and a policy of in-service training enhance the effectiveness of individuals selected and trained for their particular duties. The lay membership assumes responsibility for much of the program promotion, finances, and inter-agency cooperation in conjunction with members of the staff.

This organization had its beginnings in the Chicago area some fifteen years ago in a group of mothers organized in small informal child study groups. Nationally known experts who were brought in for public conferences stimulated so much interest in the approach that other groups were formed, and the coordination of city-wide interest was inaugurated in the Chicago Association for Child Study and Parent Education which was established in 1925 "to coordinate the efforts of organized child study groups and promote the idea of parent education." As such it became famous for its excellent conferences, its discriminating body of materials available for parents, and the soundness of its approach.

As the demand for leadership began to come in from other groups, professional staff members were employed to carry on these more technical functions; and the staff has grown throughout the last six years in answer to the increasing demand from two part-time workers to a well-balanced staff of eight trained persons.

In an attempt to interpret its growing emphasis on the whole family, and on youth as well as parent education, and to authorize its enlarging program geographically, the Chicago Association for Child Study and Parent Education changed its name in the spring of 1939 to The Association for Family Living.

*(Continued on page 86)*

# Three Pioneers in the Study of Sex

By E. W. BURGESS

Department of Sociology, University of Chicago

WITHIN three months the three leading authorities in the world on the anthropological, the cultural and the psychological aspects of sex passed away. These were Edward Alexander Westermarck, the Finnish anthropologist and sociologist; Henry Havelock Ellis, physician, scholar and editor; and Sigmund Freud, psychiatrist and founder of psychoanalysis.

Although the youngest of these three investigators into the sexual life of man, E. A. Westermarck was the first to become famous at the age of twenty-nine by his early work, *The History of Human Marriage*, published in 1891, which established his reputation. In this publication he demolished the assumed evidential basis for the theory of primordial promiscuity and presented a plausible case for the thesis that monogamy was the original form of human marriage.

In this volume appeared Westermarck's famous definition of marriage as "a more or less durable connection between male and female lasting beyond the mere act of propagation and till after the birth of the offspring." Thirty years later Westermarck published a revised edition of the *History of Human Marriage*, bringing the supporting evidence down-to-date and supplementing his earlier definition of marriage, which he still retained, by a recognition of marriage as a social custom sanctioned by public opinion.

Three years ago Westermarck published his book, *The Future of Marriage in Western Civilization*, in which he forecast the future trends of the family in terms of man's biological and psychological nature. His most recent book, published this year, was *Christianity and Morals*.

Havelock Ellis, who as a youth decided to dedicate his life to an understanding of sex, aroused a storm of denunciation by the publication of his first work in 1897 on *Sexual Inversion*. Finding a publisher in the United States, he completed his monumental work on *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* in six volumes. Highly sensitive to the misunderstanding of the purpose and meaning of his research by the pillars of British society, Ellis did not conceal his gratification when, years later, a Committee from the Church of England asked his assistance in preparing a statement on birth control.

The work of Ellis has exerted a tremendous influence upon the public opinion of our times. It was unquestionably more responsible than that of any other one man for

the lifting of the Puritan taboo upon sex. It also provided perspective and orientation to the changes in the sex mores. It paved the way for inductive research in the field of sex and marriage.

Ellis was noted for his wide correspondence with men and women in all walks of life and for his care in answering letters appealing for his advice upon problems of sex and marriage.

He was actively engaged upon his writings up to the last. One of the last papers from his pen is the article "Freud's Influence on the Changed Attitude toward Sex," a sympathetic yet critical appraisal of the work of his colleague in the study of sex which appeared in the November, 1939, issue of the *American Journal of Sociology*. Since his death has appeared his *Autobiography*, an intimate and analytical account of himself and of his married life.

Sigmund Freud, whose work aroused even more bitter controversy than that of Havelock Ellis, was a psychiatrist who was led by his association with Charcot and with Breuer to make intensive case-studies of neurotic patients in which he penetrated beneath conscious and remembered experiences to forgotten experiences, especially those of earliest childhood.

Recognizing the limitations of hypnosis with which he first experimented, he invented the methods of dream analysis and free association and their interpretation which constituted his greatest contribution to the methodology of the psychological and social sciences.

Much of the findings of Freud's theoretical analysis of mental processes are now an accepted part of social psychiatry and social psychology, such as the concepts of repression, suppression, rationalization, transference and sublimation. His emphasis upon the role of the unconscious, upon the unwitting influence of sex on much of our behavior, and upon the importance of family relations in the development of personality are now recognized as substantial contributions to our knowledge. Much of what was fantastic in his theoretical interpretations was incidental and relatively unimportant and today is being discarded by many psychoanalysts.

Only last year the Nazi seizure of Austria forced Freud into exile in England, just as the volume, *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*, edited by A. A. Brill, was being published in this country. The last year of his life

(Continued on page 95)

# From the Conferences

## Abstracts of Papers

*Trends in Family Relationships the World Over, E. A. Ross, University of Wisconsin.*—The family is not becoming less a social institution, but more. The "free love" movement, so much in evidence in the last quarter of the 19th century, has now no open adherents. The family was made for people—people were not made for the family. For this reason the individual must fit himself in. It is generally recognized that the typical personality is not altogether what it once was. The man has not changed much; the woman has changed greatly in a generation or two—the kindergartened and schooled child is a very different being from the child of the people of a century ago. If the family is to contribute its utmost to human well-being and happiness, these developments should be taken into account.

The economic bases of the home have visibly shifted. Less of economic value is produced by the mother and children in the home. More and more the problem presses: Why should not the wife and mother do something of economic significance outside the home? Incessantly the machine in the factory eats away the economic foundations of the home, and the end is not in sight. Few influential thinkers doubt that endeavor should be made to lessen the maladjustments and sources of irritation in the family. It is generally conceded that as far as possible, marriage and family should be made to fit the conditions of human happiness. No people gives evidence of so much instability in marriage as the Americans. In 1890 about one marriage in 16 terminated in the divorce court—today it is about one in six. This is an abnormal proportion and probably means that a great many brides and grooms are entering matrimony without realizing it is up to them to make a determined effort to make it a success. In other words, the possibility of divorce is in their minds when they are making their solemn vows. I would not if I could make divorce harder to attain than it now is in most parts of the country, but I would like to see an educational campaign to enlighten young people regarding the blight instability casts upon happiness.

Paper presented at the Midwest regional meeting of the National Conference on Family Relations, Chicago, April 1, 1939.

*The Family and Mental Ill-Health, L. Guy Brown, Oberlin College.*—The modern conception of mental ill-health is directing attention more and more to day-by-day

experiences which are more or less taken for granted such as experiences in the family, on the play ground, in school and in religious services. Here are developed the mental processes that are the miniature prototypes of those mental processes found in insanity. The family is not a specific pattern of behavior that manifests itself in the same way everywhere. When studied in many situations it is found to have many potentialities for both mental health and mental ill-health. Like all other social situations, the family manifests all the processes found in the mental activities of the insane individual which reveals the fact that "insanity is a social as well as an individual condition."

A study of the life of certain families reveals a great variety of processes—hatreds, morbid fears, jealousies, delusions of persecution, delusions of grandeur and inferiority, feelings of guilt, dogmatic opinions, compulsions, invalidism, and all the characteristics found in the insanities. There is a great deal of confusion, also many contradictions in married life. Accusatory delusions so common and characteristic of insanity abound in families. In some families there are carriers of mental ill-health with fears, hates, anger, malice and self-pity that communicate their moods to those about them. In some families there can be a day-by-day preparation for mental ill-health in the unconscious mind as in the conscious mind. This is not confined to those homes where there are conflicts. In the peaceful home children are often taught to be mentally disordered. Escape mechanisms are permitted and often encouraged. The spoiled and pampered child seldom meets a crisis with mental health. The sheltered child who is not prepared for broader relationships and the disconcerting facts of reality is not well equipped for mental health. When parents do not live on an adult level, they have not grown up emotionally, so they make life seem disagreeable and difficult. Parents who want their children to remain dependent often teach them to remain on a childhood level where they are not ready for adult life.

Paper presented at the Midwest regional meeting of the National Conference on Family Relations, Chicago, April 1, 1939.

*Marriage Law, Albert C. Jacobs, Columbia University.*—1,327,000 marriages are contracted in this country each year. Nearly 4,000 times each day our marriage bans are invoked to protect the families of tomorrow.

How are they performing effectively this all-important function?

The development of a public consciousness concerning our marriage laws is a vital necessity. Desirable changes therein can be effected only when society becomes thoroughly aroused as to the need thereof. It is necessary to overcome a natural reluctance on the part of legislators to interfere with marriage. Along these lines this symposium can perform an important function.

A constitutional amendment would be necessary for federal action in the field of marriage laws. Even assuming the desirability of such action, the likelihood of such an amendment at the present time seems remote. Thus, each state will continue free to adopt its own marriage policies. Our most pressing need, therefore, is to reconcile the marriage standards of immediately adjoining states, or of those in the same district. Complete uniformity throughout the country is not necessary. Fully conscious of the desirability of regional cooperation, the neighboring states, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Vermont, Massachusetts, Maine, New Hampshire, Maryland, Delaware, Rhode Island and the District of Columbia have been invited to participate in this Symposium.

A great amount of education, discussion and public interest is necessary to effect fundamental changes in our marriage laws. A year ago this Symposium was devoted to "pre-marital and prenatal examinations" for syphilis. Such tests are now required in this state. The public has become aroused to the need of such legislation. A number of states in this region have passed similar salutary statutes, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Pennsylvania. It is hoped that the other states will do so soon. The pre-marital examination should also include a test for gonorrhea and tuberculosis in a communicable state.

The so-called "gin" marriages or hasty marriages, have practically been wiped out in this region, a wise move. Public opinion has become conscious of the dangers lurking therein; that there should be a delay of several days between the application for and the issuance of the marriage license.

A most vital and pressing problem is that of a more effective administration of our marriage laws. The license issuer gives the sanction of society to a couple to embark upon the most important of life's voyages. If his powers are not wisely exercised, irreparable damage may result. Part of the answer lies in placing license issuers in the civil service.

It is our aim to focus public opinion on another matter—the marriage of mental incompetents. Little is done to prevent the marriage of idiots, lunatics, the feeble-minded, the epileptics, and of those suffering from the various psychoses. Are there any practical steps open to us? Our

aim should be to prevent the marriage of those who are mentally unfit.

There are other steps which some of the states in this region should take: the abolition of common law marriage which defies state regulation; the raising of the minimum ages for marriage, and adequate proof of age and parent consent.

By such cooperation as we have in this Conference, it is our hope that marriages of which society does not approve can no longer occur in this district. May this goal be achieved in the near future. It can be if the public becomes aroused to the desirability of such legislation.

Paper presented at the New York Conference on Marriage and the Family, April 28.

*Mental Tests and the Marriage Law, Ira S. Wile, M.D.*  
—The problem of mental incompetents and the marriage law is a challenge because, whether the mental incompetent be regarded as the feeble minded, neurotic, psychotic, epileptic, alcoholic, narcotic drug addicts, habitual criminals or chronic indigents, there is no present machinery to locate these allegedly dysgenic elements of our population.

A multitude of state laws, diverse in nature, which prohibit marriage with no uniformity of principle, is contrary to any public policy for the control of dysgenic elements of the population. If the problem of limiting the number of mental incompetents is to be faced, it can only be successfully achieved by a carefully conceived national marriage law, based upon established scientific data. Most of the state laws dealing with the marriage of mental incompetents require clarification. It is interesting to note that in eight states (Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, New Mexico and Texas) there are no provisions for prohibiting the marriage of incompetents. In four states (Arkansas, Georgia, Nevada and Ohio) the laws are very general and merely provide that persons of insane mind or incapable of giving consent may not be given a marriage license. The other states define specifically types of mental disability which makes marriage impossible. In many of the states, however, phraseology of the law indicates that it was enacted many years ago, as they provide primarily for the prohibition of marriage of idiots and lunatics or insane persons. There are, for example, 18 states that prohibit the marriage of idiots or imbeciles, while another 18 states use the term feeble minded, which theoretically might include persons with I.Q. higher than that of an idiot or imbecile. Eighteen states specify epilepsy as one of the prohibitions against marriage. In 38 states which prohibit the marriage of mentally disturbed persons, the terms insane, lunatic or unsound mind are most frequently employed.

Most marriage laws are not designed to protect marriage in terms of personal liberty, possible happiness in marriage, or in the interest of reducing the divorce rate.

Eugenic considerations actually incorporated in law appear to be based upon conjecture, desire, allegation and theory rather than established facts. The tendency to require certification of physical and mental health before a marriage license is granted is rational, but there remains considerable uncertainty as to whether making provision for voluntary sterilization will be very effective in diminishing the number of so called mental incompetents. A wider experience is necessary in order to establish the facts concerning the number of mental incompetents in the population, the number who marry, the number of children resulting from such marriages and the general mental incompetency of their children. The diversity of the present marriage laws indicate the many uncertainties related to the conceptions of and attitudes toward many incompetents. There is evidently far more stress upon provision for annulment than for prevention of unwise marriage, particularly as evidenced in the marriage laws of the State of New York. Outside of the recent provision for Wassermann testing, applications for marriage are mainly concerned with the voidability of marriage, when either of the parties entering it are "incapable of consenting to a marriage for want of understanding," "incapable of entering into the marriage state from physical cause," "incurably insane for a period of five years or more." New York state appears to be more concerned with the problem of annulment than with making provision for a sound system of licensure.

It is clear that in this era when life values are shifting, when wars constitute the greatest dysgenic threat to the human race, when man's economic security has not been attained, when social evolution has not conducted to rational ethical activities, there is little reason to rush to the regulation of marriage by laws. There is still need for ascertaining basic facts and for making thoroughly scientific evaluations of human affairs, including marriage. Our country is in dire need of an environmental rehabilitation, an equalization of opportunities for education, social growth and occupational stabilization. Only when man has been subjected to the optimum environment requisite for the development of his being, will it be possible to know beyond the shadow of a doubt the nature and mean of biological inheritance. Regulation of marriage is reasonable when man has sound knowledge concerning the traits, dispositions and behaviors which represent in large measure the conflict of his constitution and his culture. Man is socially incompetent to a larger degree than mentally incompetent.

Paper presented at the New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family, April 28.

*The Place of the Church in Family Counselling, Oliver M. Butterfield, Consultant in Family Relationships, New*

*York City.*—The church has an opportunity and an obligation to do much more counselling in family relationships than has been done up until now. Half the people in America are within the constituency of some religious organization and probably two thirds of them come to the clergy of the church for the performance of their marriage ceremonies. Nationwide in organization, lifewide in the scope of its moral and ethical teachings, the church, above all other institutions, has a responsibility for doing skilled and effective guidance in the field of family living. For ages the church has been all too content to encourage good intentions on the part of its followers. Today the needs of the hour demand that it go beyond motives and seek to guide in the formation of habits and in the work of preventive education, which will help to make impossible many of the tragic blunders of broken homes and misguided children.

Bad homes have from time immemorial been part of an endless chain of cause and effect, leading to unhappiness and failure. The best place to break this chain of circumstances is before marriage, when two people, anxious to succeed in marriage, present themselves before the church for the solemnization of their wedding vows.

Probably the most effective work now being done by the church to improve and conserve marriage and family life is the careful interviewing and instruction which is being done by many pastors in a wide variety of denominations. The young people appreciate this service and pastors are deeply interested in becoming more efficient in managing these courses of instruction. Study courses in boy and girl relations and in general preparation for marriage are now being offered by churches, not only during the special programs of summer conferences but during winter lecture series and in the regular process of weekly religious education. This direct approach to preparation for marriage is better than a thousand sermons against divorce.

A third field which is soon to become nationwide in scope is the work of parent education in church families. The excellent work of the school groups has demonstrated that when mothers and fathers become truly in earnest about religion and family life they can be led to do something about it.

A fourth service has to do with the improved training of pastors and other church workers in dealing skillfully with family troubles which arise in the best regulated families after marriage. Theological seminaries are commencing to see the importance of training men for a family-centered ministry. In this way the church gives promise of regaining its moral leadership in family life and in the solution of its problems.

Paper presented at the New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family, April 29.

# Program of the Second Annual Meeting

THE second annual meeting of the National Conference on Family Relations will be held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 26-27. The meetings will be held at the Pennsylvania School of Social Work, 311 South Juniper Street. The headquarters hotel is the Sylvania Hotel.

Philadelphia organizations cooperating in the Conference are The Marriage Counsel, the Pennsylvania School of Social Work affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania, the Interdepartmental Course on Marriage of Temple University, The Family Society, The Institute of the Pennsylvania Hospital, The Jewish Welfare Society, The Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic. The names and the affiliations of the members of the Committee on Local Arrangements are Mrs. Stuart Mudd, The Marriage Council, chairman; J. Stewart Burgess, Temple University; Karl de Schweinitz and Richmond Page, Pennsylvania School of Social Work; Frank D. Watson, Haverford College; W. Wallace Weaver, University of Pennsylvania; and Oscar Wesley, Drexel Institute.

## PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

(All meetings, unless otherwise indicated, are in the Auditorium of the Pennsylvania School of Social Work, 311 Juniper Street)

Central Topic: "The Role and Functions of the Family in a Democracy."

Tuesday, December 26

9:00-9:30 A.M.

Registration, Pennsylvania School of Social Work,  
311 Juniper Street

10:00-12:00 A.M.

General Session

### Introduction

Adolf Meyer, M.D., Johns Hopkins University, president of the National Conference on Family Relations

The Family as a Dynamic Factor in American Society

Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, chairman, New York State Conference on Marriage and the Family

Democracy and the Family

Dr. Una Bernard Sait, Claremont College

1:00-4:00 P.M.

Meetings of Conference Committees

(Open only to members of committees. Members of the National Conference planning to attend should apply to

the Secretary, National Conference on Family Relations, for assignment to committees, stating first, second and third choices.)

1. The Economic Basis of Family Life. Room 1002  
William Hodson, Commissioner of Public Welfare, New York City, Chairman.
2. Education for Marriage and Family Living. Room 904  
Ernest R. Groves, University of North Carolina, chairman; Donald Klaiss, University of North Carolina, vice-chairman; Olive Stone, William and Mary School of Social Work, secretary.
3. Eugenics and the Family. Room 1000  
Frederick Osborn, American Eugenics Society, chairman
4. Marriage and Family Counselling. Room 903  
Mrs. Stuart Mudd, Marriage Counsel, Philadelphia, chairman; Robert G. Foster, Merrill-Palmer School, secretary.
5. Marriage, Family Law and Its Administration. Room 1008  
Harriet S. Daggett, Louisiana State University, secretary.
6. Marriage and Family Research. Room 1006  
Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Cornell University, chairman.
7. Youth and Its Problems.

6:30 P.M.

Dinner Meeting, American Eugenics Society

8:00-10:00 P.M.

General Session: President Adolf Meyer presiding  
The Family in Different Types of Societies; Totalitarian, Communist, and Democratic  
Dr. Carle C. Zimmerman, Harvard University  
The Family as Cultural Agent  
Lawrence K. Frank, New York City  
The Family, the State and the Law  
Dr. Max Rheinstein, University of Chicago Law School

Wednesday, December 27

9:00-12:00 A.M.

Meetings of Conference Committees

12:15-2:00 P.M.

Luncheon Session: Luncheon Meeting of the Philadelphia Marriage Counsel, Warwick Hotel  
(Members and guests of the National Conference are invited to attend. Make reservation for luncheon tickets at

\$1.25 each with the Chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements, Mrs. Stuart Mudd, Marriage Counsel, 253 S. 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.)

#### Enslavement in Marriage

Karen Horney, M.D., New York City

2:30-4:00 P.M.

General Session to receive reports of Conference Committees: President Adolf Meyer presiding

4:00-5:30 P.M.

Meetings of Conference Committees

8:00-10:00 P.M.

General Session

#### The Biological Function of the Family

Carl G. Hartman, M.D., Johns Hopkins University

#### The Economic Basis of Family Life

Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief, Children's Bureau, United States Department of Labor.

#### The Family as Unity

Adolf Meyer, M.D., president, National Conference on Family Relations.

## Place of Meeting

Our cover design in this issue is the entrance to the Social Service Building, Philadelphia, the headquarters of the Second Annual Meeting of our National Conference on Family Relations. The Conference is meeting here as the guest of the Pennsylvania School of Social Work affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania, of which Karl de Schweinitz is the Director.

The Social Service Building, erected in 1924, is an outstanding evidence of the cooperation of social agencies in Philadelphia.

The Pennsylvania School of Social Work is one of thirty-two organizations housed in this building, located in the central business district of the city, within four and a half blocks of the City Hall. A prospectus describing this building thus states its contribution to social welfare in Philadelphia:

"The Social Service Building has more than fulfilled the expectations of those who started the enterprise. Each year has found a larger number of social agencies occupying it. The auditorium, the library, the board rooms, and other facilities have caused it increasingly to become a center of co-operation in social work in Philadelphia. The occupancy of a common headquarters has promoted mutual understanding among the agencies. Improved office layouts have facilitated economical operation. From both a social and a financial point of view the Social Service Building is indeed a success. It has its place in the life of Philadelphia as representing in material form a large section of the activities that are being carried on to further the well-being of the people of the city and the state."

## BOARD OF ADVISORY EDITORS

ADOLF MEYER, M.D.

ETHEL R. McDOWELL

LAWRENCE K. FRANK

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD

SIDONIE M. GRUENBERG

ERNEST R. GROVES

ELSWORTH HUNTINGTON

PAUL POPENOE

ARTHUR J. TODD

## LIVING

Published Quarterly by

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY RELATIONS

Editorial and Business Office

1126 E. 59th St., Chicago, Illinois

E. W. BURGESS, Acting Editor

# News and Notes

## National, Regional, State, and Local Conferences

*White House Conference on the Child in a Democracy.*—The fourth White House Conference on Children will be held in Washington, D. C., January 18-20, 1940, instead of April, 1940, as originally planned, because of many new factors arising from the war in Europe and its repercussions upon economic and social conditions in America.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, honorary chairman, has charged Conference members with the duty of reviewing the extent to which children are being deprived of essentials in their development and the ways by which citizens, as individuals, and through organized effort, public and private, may open up opportunities for children which are now lacking.

The officers of the Conference include President Roosevelt; Mrs. Roosevelt, honorary vice-chairman; Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, secretary; Katherine F. Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, executive secretary; and the following vice chairmen; Homer Folks, Frank P. Graham, Henry F. Helmholz, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Robert F. Keegan, Jacob Kepcs, Josephine Roche, and Milburn L. Wilson.

Homer Folks is chairman of the Report Committee for the 1940 Conference to draft the final report, which when revised by the Conference will determine its final conclusions and recommendations along lines of immediate action, long term planning and action, and further study.

At the fortieth annual meeting of the New York State Conference on Social Work at Rochester, October 20, Mr. Folks reviewed the work of the Conference. He said:

"Thirty years ago when President Theodore Roosevelt called the first White House Conference on Children there was no precedent for such a meeting. Since that time there has been a similar conference at the end of each ten years.

"The 1940 Conference on Children in a Democracy, the first session of which was held last April, will differ notably from its predecessors. It will be the first occasion on which programs of action dealing with such diverse phases of child welfare as education, health, recreation and social well-being will be brought together and submitted as a well-considered whole. In accordance with its theme, the Conference will deal with the well-being of all children in America, as affected by a democratic form of government and, generally speaking, by democratic ideals and attitudes, over a long period of years.

"Groups of persons of special knowledge and experience will contribute to various phases of each subject. In this

way we expect to put in order the results of research and of experience in child welfare since the 1929 White House Conference, and to consider how a democratic governmental system—federal, state and local—has affected the quality, distribution and adequacy of services for children. It will be the responsibility of the Conference to plan how these services may be made more adequate and more available to all the children in America, and more completely in accord with the latest results of scientific research and of practical experience in the fields of education, health and welfare."

To the meeting in January will be submitted the findings and programs of action recommended by the Report Committee and the various groups it has appointed. These recommendations will be submitted to the entire membership of the Conference well in advance to permit suggestions as to revisions, additions or omissions on any subject covered by the report. The Conference will provide ample opportunity for discussion before action is taken.

*The Child Study Association of America.*—The Association held an Institute on "Controversial Areas in Today's Thinking about Children" in New York City, November 17-18. Sessions were organized around the following subjects "Habit Training as a Factor in Personality Development" with addresses by Leslie B. Hohman, M.D., Johns Hopkins Medical School and Lawrence S. Kubie, M.D. Columbia University; "Psychotherapy in Children" with addresses by David M. Levy, M.D., New School for Social Research, Leo Kanner, M.D., Johns Hopkins Hospital, and Caroline Zachry, Progressive Education Association; "Intelligence Testing Today," with addresses by Walter S. Neff, College of the City of New York and Irving Lorge, Teachers College, Columbia University; and "Education at the Cross Roads," with addresses by Scott Buchanan, St. John's College and Vivian T. Thayer, Ethical Culture Schools. A novel feature of the above sessions was the provision for parent discussants. At the luncheon session the discussion centered around "Recent Trends in Radio Programs for Children."

*Iowa Conference on Family Living.*—In November the organization of the Iowa State Conference was effected with the following officers: president, C. Arnold Anderson, Iowa State College; vice-president, Mrs. Grace Chaffee, State University of Iowa; executive-secretary, L. E. Garwood, Coe College. The executive committee is composed of the above officers *ex officio* and C. W. Hart,

State University of Iowa; R. E. Wakeley, Iowa State College, J. H. Ennis, Cornell College, and Eugene Manheimer, Des Moines. Among the members of the advisory committee are: Professor E. B. Reuter, State University of Iowa, Professor George R. Davies, State University of Iowa, Professor H. C. Martin, State University of Iowa, President H. M. Gage and Dr. Alice B. Salter, of Coe College; Verne Marshall, editor, *The Gazette*, Cedar Rapids; Julia B. Meyer, director, Jewish Community Center, Des Moines; Anna Lyman, superintendent, Training School for Girls, Mitchelville, and B. E. Hickenlooper, lieutenant governor; and Mrs. Laetitia Conrad, Grinnell College.

*Southern Conference on Family Relations.*—The Proceedings of the first annual meeting in joint session of the Southern and Louisiana State Conferences, held at Louisiana State University, February 24-25, 1939 have been published under the editorship of Harriet S. Daggett, president of the Southern Conference. Although an edition of three thousand copies was issued the demand from interested persons and organizations was so great that the supply was almost exhausted shortly after publication.

*Southern Conference on "Tomorrow's Children."*—The Conference held at Atlanta, Georgia, November 9-11, had as its purpose the bringing together "for group thinking people whose professional and personal interest leads

them to be concerned over the future of the children of to-day and to-morrow." A central topic was the improvement of the quality of population with addresses by Alva Myrdal, Swedish Federation of Business and Professional Women; Donald Klaiss, University of North Carolina; Rupert Vance, University of North Carolina; Margaret Sanger, Birth Control Federation of America; and P. K. Whelpton, Scripps Foundation for Population Research. An interesting panel discussion was held on "Tomorrow's Children" treating the following aspects: "The Social Problem," W. B. Jones, Jr., University of Tennessee; "The Psychological and Educational Aspects," Max Bond, Dillard University; "The Health Problem," Roy Norton, University of North Carolina; "The Medical Problem for the Mother," Robert E. Seibels, M.D., Committee on Material Welfare, South Carolina Medical Association; "The Economic Problem," Roy L. Garis, Vanderbilt University; "The Population Problem," W. E. Garnett, Virginia Agricultural Experiment Station; "The Ethical Problem," L. M. Bristol, University of Florida; and "The Family Medium" E. T. Krueger, Vanderbilt University. The honorary chairman of the Conference is Barry Bingham, the Louisville *Courier-Journal* and the executive chairman, William E. Cole, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Copies of the Proceedings of the Conference may be obtained from Professor Cole at cost not to exceed one dollar.

## Meetings and Events

*Adult Education Council of Chicago.*—At the third annual Mid-west Regional Conference of the Council a session was devoted to preparing youth and the adult for vocational adjustment, with addresses on "The Public School Approach" by Lester J. Schloerb, Chicago Board of Education; "Job Trends," by Lyle Spencer, Science Research Associate; "Private Enterprise and Vocational Adjustment," by John C. Kennon, American Institute of Banking; and "Basic Tools for Adjustment Service" by Julian W. Boer, Social Security Board. At another session an address was given on "Education and a Program of Action for Youth," by Floyd W. Reeves, Director, American Youth Commission.

*American Sociological Society.*—The Section on Social Statistics of the Society, meeting in joint session with the American Statistical Association on December 27th, will present a program on "Statistics of Family Composition and Type of Household" with papers as follows; "Statistics of Family Composition Needed for the Social Security Program," by Barkev Sanders, Social Security Board, and "Statistics of Families in the 1940 Census," by Leon E. Truesdell, Bureau of the Census.

Two sessions of the Section on the Family under the

chairmanship of Mrs. Chase Going Woodhouse will be held. One is devoted to a discussion of two papers "Social Changes Affecting Women and Thus Influencing the Family" by Mary Fisher, Vassar College and "Social Changes Affecting the Family Directly and Thus Influencing Women" by J. K. Folsom, Vassar College. The second session centers around appraisals of education for marriage and family living, of marriage and family institutes, of marriage and family counseling agencies, and of agencies in the field of marriage and family life

*Family Welfare Association of America.*—The Association announces the publication of "Social Case Work in Practice," containing six case studies by Florence Hollis. Inquires about this and other publications on family social work and family life may be addressed to the Association at 122 East 22nd St., New York City.

*American Youth Commission.*—The statement of "A Program of Action for American Youth" has been released by Floyd W. Reeves, director of the American Youth Commission.

Part of the statement is as follows: "The survival of the nation therefore demands that conditions be established under which the young may have confidence in

our institutions and our form of government. This means in particular that our deficiencies in the fields of employment, education, and health must speedily be corrected. The health and general physical well-being of young people must be safeguarded and improved in every possible way. Opportunities for adequate education must be made available for all. Useful employment must be provided to deliver youth from the bondage of unemployment.

"The fact that much has been left undone in the past and that past neglect cannot be overcome in a year or ten years is no cause for discouragement now. Morale is built not only by accomplishment, but also by hope. . . .

"In the face of the present world crisis, the Commission therefore urges that the government, the schools, and all organizations concerned with the welfare of youth, expand their programs and redouble their efforts. The immediate objectives should be improvement of the health, education, and employment opportunities of young people, to the end that they may have a sense of quickening life and power in this nation. Yet in all this and through all of this, youth must become increasingly aware of higher spiritual values and led to approach that understanding of human nature and of human destiny which gives democracy its reason for existence. Only if they have that understanding and our democracy is still a living force may we expect young people to devote to it their best energies throughout their lives."

On three Monday evenings from November 20 to December 4, the Commission made public three series of recommendations as follows: "Peace and Jobs for Youth," by Floyd W. Reeves and George F. Zook; "The Young and the Strong," by John W. Studebaker, Matthew Woll and Dr. Reeves, and "Good Schools for All," by Willard E. Givens, Father George Johnson, and George F. Zook.

*Association for Family Living.*—The annual meeting of the association was held November first with an address by W. Carson Ryan, New York City, president of the Child Study Association of America on the subject "Education for Family Living: Its Significance for the Times."

*Chicago Society for Personality Study.*—The first meeting of the autumn held October 25 was devoted to the subject "Cultural and Psychiatric Factors in Marital Adjustment" with papers by E. W. Burgess, sociologist and David Slight, psychiatrist with discussion by Conrad S. Sommer, director, Illinois Society for Mental Hygiene, Catherine Lilly Bacon, Institute for Psychoanalysis, and Joseph C. Rheingold, psychiatrist specializing in marriage counseling.

*Civilian Conservation Corps Camps.*—Each of the 150 CCC camps in the midwest division has two hundred boys under the selected leadership of a director staff from the United States Army, a work project staff from the

Conservation services, and a director of educational activities. These 150 educational advisors in their annual meeting at Lake Geneva in July, 1938 considered relating the camp educational opportunities to the boy's adjustment in his community. Realizing that most of these boys marry soon after their camp experience, the advisors set aside a full day in their 1939 conference for the consideration of education for marriage and family life. Mrs. Evelyn M. Duvall, Association for Family Living was asked to serve as their resource. Plans were laid down during that conference for the incorporation of pre-marital guidance in the counseling and educational program of many of the 150 camps in this region. Libraries of suitable books in the field are being added to the camp shelves and plans are under way to incorporate some of the more vital approaches in education for marriage and family living in the CCC camp programs throughout the middle west.

*Children in Elementary Schools.*—According to records of the U. S. Office of Education, there are approximately 22,000,000 children ranging in age from 5 to 14 in elementary schools, public and private, throughout the country. They are taught by more than 650,000 teachers. Principals, supervisors, superintendents, and service employees swell the number beyond 700,000. The latest published figures available show that slightly more than half of the children in public elementary schools in this country attend school in a community of 2,500 population or less. They go to school approximately 33 weeks of the year at an average cost of \$56.39 per child.

*The Inter-Council Committee on Christian Family Life.*—The Committee, representing the Federal Council, the International Council of Religious Education and the National Council of Church Women, held its first meeting at Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, July 12-15, in connection with the United Christian Adult Movement. This Committee has been created to facilitate cooperative efforts of these three bodies in the field of family life and to make a more united impact upon the nation. The officers are L. Foster Wood, chairman; Harry C. Munro, secretary. Other members present at these meetings were Mrs. H. W. Crowe, Mrs. D. M. Phipps, Mrs. Arthur C. Elliott, Professor Paul H. Vieth, Mr. C. W. Longman, and Rev. Edward P. Westphal.

*National Association for Nursery Education.*—The Association, meeting in New York City October 25-28, included in its program a session on "Family Aspects of Nursery Education," and a panel discussion on "Parents Look at Nursery Education." Two of the papers presented at general sessions were, "The Misunderstood Parent," given by Jean Macfarlane, University of California and "The Environment of the Young Child: Some Iowa Studies" by Ruth Updegraff, Iowa Research Station.

*Organization of Air Youth of America.*—This new

national agency was organized to assist the 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 youths already participating in junior aeronautics and to stimulate further developments in this hobby-sport-training according to an announcement by Winthrop Rockefeller, son of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., as temporary chairman of the new agency's organizing committee. The results of a year's survey showed that youth's efforts to take part in the growing science of aeronautics were hampered by inadequate aids for existing leadership. This survey—and the successful efforts of aviation clubs in helping constructively to occupy youth's leisure-time activity, which if unguided often leads to delinquency—led the committee to plan a program to furnish a service center for those nation-wide, state-wide and community agencies which have similar interests in junior aeronautics.

The organizing committee comprise Mr. Rockefeller, acting chairman; Col. Henry Breckinridge, attorney; Leon Fraser, First National Bank of New York; Dr. Luther Gulick, Columbia University; Sanford Bates, director of the Boys' Clubs of America; and Lester D. Gardner, Institute of Aeronautical Sciences.

*Progressive Education Association.*—At the annual national conference of the Association in Chicago February 19-24, one session planned by the Association for Family Living will be held on the topic, "Can the Family

Meet the Needs of Children?" Three sessions will be held on the subjects: "Current Findings Reflecting the Needs of Children," "Wider Approaches through Education and Community Programs for Meeting Children's Needs," and "Some Modern Techniques, such as Radio and Motion Pictures, in Meeting Children's Needs"; with papers by leading specialists in the field of child study.

*University of Michigan.*—For the third season a Marriage Relations Course open to senior and graduate students was given at the University of Michigan by four authorities on various phases of marriage, during the autumn.

The first lecture was by Ernest G. Osborne, Teachers College, Columbia University, who talked on "Psychological Factors in Modern Marriage."

Dr. Raymond Squier, practicing gynecologist and obstetrician, New York City, presented the second and third lectures. Fourth in the series was a lecture on "Marriage Adjustments" by Robert G. Foster, consulting psychologist, Merrill-Palmer School, Detroit. "Courtship and Pre-Marital Relations" was the subject of the final talk by Mary Shattuck Fisher, Vassar College.

On October 29 Arthur E. Wood, professor of sociology, gave a radio address over the University Broadcasting Service on the subject "Marriage Counseling."

## Personal Notes

The University of Pennsylvania Press announces the publication of *Marriage and the Child* by James H. S. Bossard.

The book *Adventuring in Adoption* by Professor and Mrs. Lee M. Brooks has been published by the University of North Carolina Press.

A study dealing with the personality development of Negro adolescents in New Orleans, Louisiana, and Natchez, Mississippi, by Allison Davis, Dillard University, and John Dollard, Yale University, will soon be published by the American Council of Education.

The book *People, the Quantity and Quality of Population* by Henry Pratt Fairchild has been recently published by Henry Holt and Company.

Edward W. Gregory, Jr., professor of sociology, and Lee Bidgood, dean of the School of Commerce and Business Administration, University of Alabama, in their recent volume *Introductory Sociology, a Study of American Society* devote Part III to the family, its development as a social institution, social change and maladjustment.

Yale University Press announces the publication of "Soviet Housing Laws" by J. N. Hazard, who lived three years in Moscow, where he attended the Moscow Juridical Institute.

*The Child in the Home* by Leila Wall Hunt, head of foods and nutrition, college of home economics, State College of Washington and published by Prentice-Hall in its home and family life series, edited by Helen Judy Bond is designed primarily as a college text for a general course in child care and development but also for use in study groups.

A detailed analysis of family expenditures in the United States in 1935-36, a further breakdown of the more general data presented in *Consumer Expenditures in the United States—Estimates for 1935-36* (June 1939), is now being made under the direction of Hildegard Kneeland for the National Resources Planning Board.

The University of Chicago Press announce the publication of a revised edition by Ernest R. Mowrer, sociologist, Northwestern University of *Family Organization* with a new chapter on "Recent Trends in Family Disorganization" which contains up-to-date statistical data on marriages and divorces.

Mrs. Harvey Seeley Mudd of Los Angeles, California, has been elected president of the Girl Scouts of America. She has stated that during her presidency emphasis in the Girl Scouts Movement will be placed upon the home as the smallest unit of a democracy and on Girl Scouts as home makers.

Frances Bruce Strain, lecturer, writer and author of *Being Born and New Patterns in Sex Teachings*, has written a new work *Love at the Threshold, a Book on Dating, Romance, and Marriage* which is published by D. Appleton-Century Company.

Greenberg announces the publication of *The Challenge of Adolescence* by Ira S. Wile, M. D., psychiatrist, author of *The Challenge of Childhood* and *The Man Takes a Wife*.

Mrs. Marion Moss Burbank, formerly in parent education work, is now head of the Home Administration Department, Los Angeles City College, and is teaching courses in marriage and family life.

Dr. Katherine W. Taylor, formerly with the Wisconsin Department of Mental Hygiene, is now with the School of Education in the University of Syracuse and continuing work in the field of family relations.

## *The Family in the Machine Age*

(Continued from page 68)

to the changed needs of the urban man.

Because of the widespread disorganization of the family, which is apparent in the statistics of divorce, desertion, and juvenile delinquency, many persons have become alarmed lest the family disappear. Yet there is no indication that family life is any more unpopular than it was a hundred years ago, if one may judge from the ratio of the married to the unmarried in the population, the widespread interest in research, and the development of family clinics for the study and prevention of family disintegration. Family life will continue so long as it is possible for human beings to find satisfactions in this relationship which they do not find elsewhere.

Central in the function of the family in modern life is the retreat which it should provide for both husband and wife. It is in the family circle in which the activities of life may take on new meanings, out of the sympathy, appreciation, and encouragement which the family provides. This creation of meaning is largely due to the fact that in the family is generated that emotional contentment which provides the motivation so necessary to social adjustment.

The keen edge of disappointment may be dulled in the family, and the individual rehabilitated. In family relations the individual may find that integration of hopes and purposes which counteracts the trend in modern life toward dissociation, with its inevitable mental conflict.

To the child, also, the family should perform well-defined functions in providing the locale for the development of an integrated personality. Some success seems essential for the development of adjusted personalities, and this may be supplied in the reassurances within the family circle. In the family, also, the child learns the art of adjusting himself to other individuals under conditions which should be conducive to the integrity of personality, if there is a tempering of consequences by sympathy and understanding. Thus it is apparent that with the disappearance of other functions, the demands upon the family as a mechanism for the supplying of affection, comradeship, intimate appreciation, and sympathy become all the more insistent. How well the family performs these functions will determine its survival in the machine age.

## *The Association for Family Living*

(Continued from page 75)

The Association receives its major income from the large body of lay members who contribute to its work and pay for individual and group service. The Community Fund of Chicago makes up the annual deficit incurred in the large service program available to other agencies in the city.

All persons interested in such a program are welcomed into membership at the payment of small annual dues and enjoy as privileges the office courses, institutes, and large public conferences available through the year, individual

consultation, library privileges, and the receipt of regular monthly Child Study News, bulletins, Book Service, and Parents' Digest of recommendations of programs and educational and entertainment value recommended for family participation.

The greatest need of this "educational organization with a social purpose" is for the interest and support of a growing body of socially sensitive citizens who will make for a more adequate functioning toward social progress and individual happiness.

# What A Wife Was Juliet

A LITTLE while ago it would have been fair to say that the lives of Romeo and Juliet were a part of the thoughts and feelings of the commonality of people everywhere in the English-speaking world. Even as things are now, this is largely true; and we may be sure of this regardless of how we come out on the question of whether Shakespeare is in fact more widely read and played than formerly.

But ever since Shakespeare's time people have thought of Romeo and Juliet as an inseparable pair. They were not individual human beings at all. They were the perfect lovers. As such it was forbidden for you to like one or the other in varying degrees. You must think of them only as a unit; you just acknowledge their equal supremacy, and you must give exactly the same admiration to each. This did grave injury to the play itself by eliminating all partisanship in which you take one side and defend the hero or hate the villain with every bit of loyalty and fire that you have. We are justly told that the audience is a large part of any play; and an audience that has not its preferences, indeed its fervent loyalties, is a rather feeble part of the play itself. Such an attitude dishonors the play and dishonors the main characters. It reduces it all to the quiet passivity of a medieval mask, interrupted to be sure by lots of fights, murders and other action, but still lacking the honest allegiance of the public.

Now if there is any excuse for this apparently equal admiration for both characters, I blame it on Romeo. I am willing to admit that the exigencies of the drama in Shakespeare's time made it necessary to introduce Romeo as a conventional lover and load the poor man down with a previous love affair which Juliet escaped. I deny that this or anything else can justify Romeo's pretences and everlasting watchfulness to see what kind of an effect he is making right in the middle of his love making, and later on during the long dreary scene when he is dying so loquaciously. The point is, for all Romeo's skill in killing people, he simply is not an honest-to-God man. Of course all men are inclined to strut and parade their virtues. And it is one of the dearest phases of the mother instinct that women can understand this, and even like it, with that indulgence in which they always see the charm and follies of the little boy that crop out through the actions of the grown man. But Romeo goes much further than this. His is not a rather attractive tendency to show off his own courage and his own better points, in various forms of pleasantly lying and juggling of events to his own advantage. No, it is more than that: the man can't keep his eyes from admiring himself—even in the midst of his proposal of marriage and at the point of death.

If you want an instance of this last, consider the balcony scene itself. Just before Romeo leaves, you remember Juliet has called him back again:

"Hist! Romeo, hist! O, for a falconer's voice,  
To lure this tassel-gentle back again!  
Bondage is hoarse, and may not speak aloud;  
Else would I tear the cave where Echo lies,  
And make her airy tongue more hoarse than mine,  
With repetition of my Romeo's name."

And to this, Romeo answers:

"It is my soul that calls upon my name:  
How silver-sweet sound lovers' tongues by night,  
Like softest music to attending ears!"

Now I have no objection to his saying that his soul (i.e., Juliet) is calling on his name, though even this in a technical sense is fully fifty percent concern about himself, and only fifty percent concern about the lady. But I do say that the next two lines of admiration for "lovers' tongues" (and inevitably his own) is downright strutting and overwhelming admiration for his own attractiveness. The plain truth is that the man couldn't forget himself even on that rare occasion when any common garden variety of human being is supposed to forget himself to the point of fantastic incoherence when he is actually asking the young lady to marry him. Romeo is something of an exhibitionist and no mistake.

And when you consider that the poor fellow has to bear all the burden of his previous love affair and his ponderous role as conventional lover at the same time, why then his affectations, and his crude vanity stand out all the more and make him at times just plain offensive.

But self-admiration, a certain formalism and an attitude of rather forced indifference to the world are not Romeo's only faults. His formalism and his polite indifference at least are perhaps indigenous to his role as conventional lover. But his self-admiration must be counted a positive fault; and along with this, I think we will also have to place that most embarrassing of all faults in a hero—cowardice—or something pretty close to it. You will remember that Friar Lawrence who knew him well did not think much of him. He emphatically reminded Romeo that he, Romeo, had just been in love with Rosamund, and indeed the friar was disinclined to officiate at the marriage at all except on the ground it would tend to promote the peace, since the warring houses of Montague and Capulet would thereby be united. He emphatically did not put much credence in the match on any theory of overwhelming personal attachment.

If it be urged that Romeo had personal courage at least

of a physical type—witness the fights with Tybalt and Paris in both of which he killed his opponents—this much must be conceded. But at a time and in a country when duels and life and death brawls were a daily occurrence, not very much can be said for his character from this alone.

On the moral side and in the whole field of taking responsibility and carrying it like a man, he does not come off well. First of all, when he learns of Juliet's apparent death, he consciously and through elaborate reasoning, fixes upon suicide from the first moment he heard this news. But he did not carry out his intent quickly, as a matter of overwhelming emotional reaction (so called temporary insanity according to the jargon of our day). No, the man played with the idea of suicide, getting almost a sadistic delight from his self-destruction, with his everlasting talk about it himself, and more and even worse talk about suicide by the apothecary who sold him the poison and found a certain vicarious enjoyment in the high-flown exploit.

So far as the poison itself goes, this also was not as impressive as it might be. Suicide may well involve a moral cowardice, but many people who have tried it have found themselves unequal to its accomplishment when attempted by some of the more disagreeable means—jumping off buildings, shooting themselves with revolvers and other violent and direct methods. But if suicide itself is a mark of cowardice, then surely one would have to be pretty far down the list in the gradation of cowardice not to be able to drink some poison, assuming of course that he is already fixed on suicide, and also perhaps that the poison is not particularly disagreeable to take.

It certainly is not an instance of emotional instability in which one kills himself on the spur of the moment due to the inescapable and overwhelming force of some grief or emergency involving one's honor or his affections. Romeo's suicide was premeditated and reasoned out with an elaborate detail over a long period of time.

Furthermore, Romeo does not even consider a possible alternative for suicide; this last seems extreme weakness. If he killed himself as an immediate emotional reaction from some tragic incident, in which his reasoning powers were entirely overcome, we would not expect him to reflect on other possible solutions since we postulate at the outset that he does not reflect even about taking his own life. But this is not Romeo's case. The truth is Romeo slows up the play and bores the audience by his everlasting talk about his delayed suicide. Could he not at least give us a little human interest by some bright discussion of alternatives? Certainly the apothecary scenes would be much better theatre if Romeo would discuss, even if he later rejected, some plan by which he could also live not for purposes of revenge, but to labor in honor of Juliet's

memory and to realize in part the accomplishments which her untimely death had prevented.

A good moralistic pagan like the elder Cato would have made this scene magnificent; and any contemporary of Romeo in this period of Italian history, who happened to be a well trained scholastic protagonist, would have done the same thing. But Romeo was neither pagan nor Christian so far as any vigorous concern about moral values went. He was just a plain young man, bored with one love affair and waiting to fall into another. He was a traditional man-about-town, of good family, who fell in love with the very prettiest girl he had ever seen; he was also the conventional hero who fights with various well-intentioned but less skillful opponents and always wins. If we admit that he was dignified, and showed some little fervor in the actual love scenes, we must chalk much more up on the negative side by recognizing that he was something of an exhibitionist even when purporting to think of his lady; and that when real responsibility and difficulty came upon him—when his life was broken and his lady died—he played the part of a coward, after due reflection and analysis of his own weak conduct.

Now things are quite different in the case of Juliet. While she has at every turn the most charming dignity and modesty, she has, at the very same time, absolute directness and fervent concern which leads her to keen partisanship in everything that happens. She is never politely weary of the world or genteelly astonished at anything, not even her husband's banishment. She does not faint (although this was quite usual for well-brought-up young ladies of her time), and she does not rail against the hard life she has to lead or run to others for help. Perhaps I can indicate a little of the beauty and fire of her character if I say that she was as different as night is from day, from the milk and water disgrace that was recently perpetrated as a cinema production of this great play, with two of the leading actors of our time in the chief parts, and with accompanying fan-fare by the newspapers, and nauseating praise by the critics. For this cinema production that received universal commendation in the press, made the house of a petty aristocrat in a petty Italian city, more gorgeous than that of any prince in Italy; and it not only robbed Romeo of whatever fire he might have acquired by the very quality of the play, but it slaughtered Juliet, making her a "fine lady," bored with the world, and likely to fall any minute from faintness and genteel ennui.

On the other hand, the general public liked the movie version of Romeo and Juliet, and perhaps rightly so. The bases of this preference were perhaps the two great philosophical axioms; first, you can't have everything; and, second, blessed are they what don't expect nothing, for they won't be disappointed. The cinema version had two real assets. First, the scenery was gorgeous, and the

romantic setting in the medieval Italian castle was most beguiling and attractive to modern eyes in this busy world. Second, the awful ranting, that, truth to tell, the very greatest productions of Shakespeare formerly indulged in, was happily absent—except for the case of Mercutio, and that was a very minor error. But surely no one can seriously claim that Romeo and Juliet as Shakespeare conceived it was fairly represented in this version.

From beginning to end Juliet is made of one piece. She does not live her life in compartments like a coward, maintaining the high quality of one part, while permitting another and perhaps suppressed part to harbor inferior elements. The very first thing she says in the play is both dignified and convincingly direct. With the frankness of a Renaissance Italian her mother asks if she wants to be married. Just married you understand, never mind who her husband is. Juliet answers with no evasion or simpering weakness, but with honest frankness and charming modesty: "It is an honor that I dream not of." And from this point to the last she always maintains decorum and tries to fulfill her duty, but she does everything so honestly and naturally that at no time is her separate and individual self lost in the rather fixed obligations of her daily life.

Why should I growl about Romeo's artificial lovemaking; Juliet is so convincing and so honest that she does not stand out in cold contrast with Romeo; she puts some of her own fervor into the man so that his colorless speeches take on conviction on the theory that they must be real since they are about her and since she is there when he speaks them. I can even forgive Romeo for his everlasting talk about Juliet's physical beauty or her other elements of attractiveness. And this is in spite of the plain fact that he does not say a word about her conduct or her character—about anything that makes her a human being—from one end of the play to the other. His is a kind of stupid commendation much of the time but at least he uses superlative language and that is satisfying. When he says: "Oh speak again, bright angel!" he has said just what every poor creature in the audience thinks should be said and it doesn't much matter whether or not he understands the full import of his wish. Why blame the man, words are poor things to use of Juliet at the best!

Now of course Juliet does not exclaim about Romeo's good looks, or in truth does she deal with his moral qualities absent or present. To have her talk about his good looks would have been insufferable. True, she does not talk about his moral qualities either; and we like to think that she found some, because we like to think all good things of her. But this defect is overcome in fact—that is for artistic truth—by Juliet's failure to talk about any attribute of her hero. She just talks about how

much she loves him, and the rest of us think everything she thinks is right and uncritically share her delight in the man she has chosen.

But the truth is Romeo seems largely not so much a foil as an appropriate background for Juliet when he tells us:

"But, soft! what light through yonder window breaks?  
It is the east, and Juliet is the sun.  
Arise, fair sun, and kill the envious moon,  
Who is already sick and pale with grief,  
That thou her maid art far more fair than she."

This settles it; after this no man cares how she looks. She has an honest heart and a true mind and if Romeo or anyone else wants to compare her with the morning sunlight or the evening star, that's all right too.

Oliver Wendell Holmes made the somewhat playful, somewhat original remark that women should be silent as much as possible; he argued, while they were silent, nature worked for them, but when they began to talk they had to work for themselves. To take an epigram literally, is of course folly; but as we pick this one to pieces a bit, we will find it is the equivalent of saying that the dear lady probably doesn't amount to much on any theory, and that her best course is to keep quiet and not reveal her deficiencies. I have seen many Juliets on the stage that were anything but beautiful, but this didn't matter. Perhaps I had a weak, halting faith in the integrity of life itself, but I had no doubt about her. To talk syllogistically, one could not worry about life at large in her presence; she was honest, she was brave, she had a clear mind and a daring, understanding heart. No one could breathe in this world and not believe in her. Well then, that settled it. You believed in her, she was alive, you believed in life.

This was not romantic love. You never dreamed she would love you, you didn't want her to. But it was redeeming life. Not redeeming character, mind you. Character yes, but much more than that. Truth, courage, infinite understanding, infinite tenderness, not the abstract, but living and breathing before your eyes!

And Juliet has a hard-working, practical head on her shoulders. She does the everyday things that makes life livable in this difficult world. And these in turn give conviction as embroidered phrases and generalities could never do.

She gets down to cases with all the fervor and charm and directness of young girlhood, and she sweeps difficulties aside until the results she wants (and all her loyal knights in the audience also want) are achieved:

"'Tis but thy name that is my enemy;  
Thou art thyself, though not a Montague.  
What's Montague? it is nor hand, nor foot,  
Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part  
Belonging to a man. O, be some other name!

What's in a name? that which we call a rose  
By any other name would smell as sweet;  
So Romeo would, were he not Romeo call'd,  
Retain thy dear perfection which he owes  
Without that title. Romeo, doff they name,  
And for that name which is no part of thee  
Take all myself."

This is a bit hard on Romeo. His best expressions seem not more than fitting background for the fiery darts of Juliet. This reverses the thing a bit. As a woman, and in a very formal age, it was her right to be somewhat negative and let the man do the worrying, and press his suit aggressively. But by some miracle, Juliet can be the aggressor in every essential way, yet not in the slightest degree offend our sense of decorum or seem to impair the masculine integrity of her hero in any way. Remember this, it is *she* who proposes the marriage, although not one person in a hundred who sees the play realizes this; and in fact it is *she* who makes all the arrangements and works and maneuvers to manage the wedding ceremony itself and make sure that Romeo is actually there on time.

"Thou know'st the mask of night is on my face,  
Else would a maiden blush bapaint my cheek  
For that which thou hast heard me speak tonight.  
Fain would I dwell on form, fain, fain deny  
What I have spoke: but farewell compliment!  
Dost thou love me? I know thou wilt say 'Ay,'  
And I will take thy word: yet, if thou swear st,  
Thou mayst prove false; at lovers' perjuries,  
They say, Jove laughs. O gentle Romeo,  
If thou dost love, pronounce it faithfully:  
Or if thou think'st I am too quickly won,  
I'll frown and be perverse and say thee nay,  
So thou wilt woo; but else, not for the world.  
In truth, fair Montague, I am too fond,  
And therefore thou mayst think my 'haviour light:  
But trust me, gentleman, I'll prove more true  
Than those that have more cunning to be strange.  
I should have been more strange, I must confess,  
But that thou overheard'st, ere I was ware,  
My true love's passion: therefore pardon me,  
And not impute this yielding to light love,  
Which the dark night hath so discovered."

Of course no flesh and blood man could make any comment on a speech like that. But the play has to go on and Shakespeare has to make his hero do something! But what a botch Romeo makes of it! Listen to this colorless, mechanical thing that Romeo says immediately after:

"Lady, by yonder blessed moon I swear  
That tips with silver all these fruit-tree tops—"

With her impetuosity and down-right honesty, Juliet breaks in on this harangue and objects that an oath made on the changing moon is not very convincing. And then Romeo reaches depths of stupidity that are unusual even for him. He wants to know what to swear by, as if the poor girl has to do his love-making for him along with

everything else! But Juliet is not displeased or even surprised. She rushes to his aid naturally, easily, inevitably, as a true mate, and a wife who has given her whole heart and mind to him. She just plain tells him what he is too thick to see and she tells him the secret of the stars and the secret of marriage, which few people even dimly realize, and which no one before or since has ever put into such words of burning life.

"Do not swear at all;  
Or, if thou wilt, swear by thy gracious self,  
Which is the god of my idolatry,  
And I'll believe thee."

This is the high point of the great drama, although it is not so recognized under the mechanical division of dramatic writing, according to the best scholarly laws of the critics. It transcends any comment by anyone, as art itself must also transcend criticism.

Can I think of Romeo as one who is somewhat in love with being in love, a man whose manners are affected, who lacks moral courage, who can't think vigorously or act vigorously and who in general is a good deal of a stuffed-shirt, and still be fair to him, still see his good qualities? Yes—that's a mere bagatelle for me! I like him, I have sympathy for the poor fellow. Who wouldn't sympathize with any man who is left defenseless in a garden at night and experiences a head-on collision with a ball of living fire like Juliet? And the man did have some real virtues—not the ones that are usually chalked up to his credit—those are fakes. The man did have real virtues that made him a human being and might have made him a very successful husband—the kind of virtues that wear well and are pleasant and reassuring to live with long after the ecstasies of the balcony scene have been many years in the past. For all his formalism, he had a flexible mind and—more important still—he had considerable capacity for companionship. That is, it was not just plain adoration for each other on the same level and without variety. This of course is of the essence of the sickening variety of love making. No well balanced, healthy man or woman can stand that sort of thing for long. There must be a give and take in the business, there must be a freedom for variation and individual flights of delight or indignation, by both parties. But, again, if this variety and free-lance sort of living in thought and feeling is not to go too far the other way, and change our loving unity into a cat and dog fight, there must again be restraint and understanding.

Of course there are various ways to describe the necessary elements here. Perhaps this will say it: two people who have the moral character and capacity for understanding and actual affection and respect that make marriage possible, should have in particular, this incidental phase of these qualities, namely, quick and comforting capacity to see the other person's need, and not, as the

phrase goes, "let him down." I recall an old friend who frequently let himself down (he was generally considered a failure) but who never let any one else down. He was, as it were, a sort of guarantor for others of the necessary prerequisites to happiness. At least so far as the person he lived with was concerned, she knew that within the sphere of his reasonable activity, the elements of comfort and delight would be assured to her as long as there was breath left in his body. Well that is not such a bad hero. The man had the capacity to give and he had the dependability of character to make you sure of this.

And one of the charms, one of the significant high qualities of Romeo and Juliet, is that for all their fervent love making, they had at the same time, the greatest individual freedom of thought and fancy; they liked to talk to each other and they did talk to each other about all manner of things of common interest. And in their talk each had great capacity to meet the other's sally, or the other's inference in a quick and stimulating and comforting way, so that their separate and varied forms of thought or feeling were always met by some other comment that supplemented them or even contradicted them; but whether by supplement or contradiction would nevertheless in an artistic sense preserve their unity, and leave each one stronger and more confident after the other's comment than before.

This is fine! It gives Romeo and Juliet all the intimate conviction of a man and girl whom we might know—who were just grand people that had similar interests when they were in college together, but were mercifully unlike most of our college graduates in their capacity to talk to each other, and *share* their fun and interests together. We like their fresh and stimulating flashes of wit, and we sense their little darts of understanding, even when these are achieved by contradictions and playful disagreements. And just as Juliet never lets Romeo down, or Romeo never lets Juliet down, so both of them together never let the reader down, or better still, the one who sees the play. By some blessed miracle, we are transported for a little while from the harsh world, in which all of us are more or less "let down" twenty times a day. We find ourselves with a young man and his wife (Romeo and Juliet) who have fire of thought and feeling, and at the same time the comforting and soothing and strengthening force of understanding, and constant care—wise and tender care—unremitting care—and the kind of care that you know is unremitting all the time.

"If my heart's dear love"—says Romeo, and then Juliet interrupts and snatches the thought away from him and rushes off on some tangent of her own, quite different from what his more prosaic mind had in view.

"Well, do not swear: although I joy in thee,  
I have no joy of this contract to-night:  
It is too rash, too unadvised, too sudden;

Too like the lightning, which doth cease to be  
Ere one can say 'It lightens.' "

But this speech, revealing in itself, and differing from Romeo's—contradictory in a literal sense—will, nevertheless, in an artistic sense and in every real and human sense, prove complementary to what he said and will enrich and strengthen his thought.

And the same strange, varied and delightful interplay of thought and feeling is everywhere present. For instance, Romeo complains of his abrupt dismissal. He wants to know if she has withdrawn her love, and if so, why.

"Wouldst thou withdraw it? for what purpose, love?"

And Juliet tells him—

"But to be frank, and give it thee again.  
And yet I wish but for the thing I have:  
My bounty is as boundless as the sea,  
My love as deep; the more I give thee,  
The more I have, for both are infinite."

And hand in hand with her fervent protestations and the quick and playful banter, there is also practicality in this young lady: "Although she was on pleasure bent, she had a frugal mind." All this romantic talk on the balcony in Verona by moonlight is very nice, and certainly Juliet enjoys it as much as any other young girl who likes brave young men to pay her compliments and plans some day to pick out one of them and marry him. But on this occasion Juliet has more in mind than that; and since Romeo—as usual—as always—is three or four jumps behind on everything, and has to be prodded and coached on what comes next (and incidentally gets into all manner of trouble when he is off on his own and doesn't have Juliet around to take care of him) since, as I said, Juliet can't count on Romeo to make the next move in the appropriate way, she takes hold of the thing herself, and makes sure of whether or not this really is a proposal of marriage.

"Three words, dear Romeo, and good night indeed.  
If that thy bent of love be honourable,  
Thy purpose marriage, send me word tomorrow,  
By one that I'll procure to come to thee,  
Where and what time thou wilt perform the rite;  
And all my fortunes at thy foot I'll lay  
And follow thee my lord throughout the world"

And once she has gotten this matter of a definite proposal settled—which again—in the case of romantic Italians was not such an easy thing to do—and remembering once more that Romeo had been in love before he married Juliet, and had no doubt talked much the same way to the other young lady—having done this I say, Juliet goes right ahead to tie the matter down tight with a definite date for a marriage, and a positive injunction for Romeo to be on time.

"At what o'clock to-morrow  
Shall I send to thee?"

And once she has married him she wants him for her own. And if there ever were a girl who knew what marriage is, and who was bravely anxious and willing to take the risks and to give all (just as she said she would) why then Juliet is she, and no mistake. She does not let her lover down, she does not let the audience or the reader down, and she does not let down or disappoint the critical and ethical analysis of her character in spite of three-hundred years of the closest study.

"Gallop apace, you fiery-footed steeds,  
Towards Phoebus' lodging: such a waggoner  
As Phaethon would whip you to the west,  
And bring in cloudy night immediately.  
Spread thy close curtain, love-performing night,  
That runaways' eyes may wink, and Romeo  
Leap to these arms, untalk'd of and unseen.  
Lovers can see to do their amorous rites  
By their own beauties; or, if love be blind,  
It best agrees with night."

"Come, night; come, Romeo; come, thou day in night;  
For thou wilt lie upon the wings of night  
Whiter than new snow on a raven's back.  
Come gentle night come, loving, black-brow'd night,  
Give me my Romeo; and, when he shall die,  
Take him and cut him out in little stars,  
And he will make the face of heaven so fine  
That all the world will be in love with night  
And pay no worship to the garish sun.  
O, I have bought the mansion of a love,  
But not possess'd it, and, though I am sold  
Not yet enjoy'd: so tedious is this day  
As is the night before some festival  
To an impatient child that hath new robes  
And may not wear them. O, here comes my nurse,  
And she brings news; and every tongue that speaks  
But Romeo's name speaks heavenly eloquence."

Once married, Juliet makes a good wife in fact. She works—she does everything that is necessary to make the marriage succeed—every day in little things, unpleasant and embarrassing things, and big, dangerous things even to the risk of her life. And when I mention that Juliet works—tries—to make the marriage succeed, perhaps my reader (being female) wonders if I mean to imply that she does not. Then I say "Madam, God forbid that I accuse you in a rude manner—but if the shoe fits, you may wear it!"

But while you may be beguiled into thinking most of the time that Juliet, though very human, is also perfect, you must note that Shakespeare makes Juliet's marriage conform to the marriage experiences of most people in this hard world—her troubles begin as soon as the wedding is over. A few hours after her marriage, Romeo—acting of course in the most punctilious manner in every way—is forced to kill her cousin Tybalt. This means another outbreak of the feud between the Montagues and the

Capulets. The Prince of Verona banishes Romeo. Juliet is stunned by the news, but not for long. She does not fall in a faint, or wring her hands in despair. She does, at least at first, fulminate against Romeo for killing her cousin, and we honor her for it. This shows no weakness in her capacity to form judgments of right and wrong and in her deep power for loyalty. But here as in everything else her mind and heart seem to strike directly for the higher loyalty.

"What storm is this that blows so contrary?  
Is Romeo slaughter'd, and is Tybalt dead?  
My dear-loved cousin, and my dearer lord?  
Then, dreadful trumpet, sound the general doom!  
For who is living if those two are gone?  
O serpent heart, hid with a flowering face!  
Did ever dragon keep so fair a cave?  
Beautiful tyrant! fiend angelical!  
Dove-feather'd raven! wolvish-ravening lamb!  
Despised substance of divinest show!  
Just opposite to what thou justly seem'st,  
A damned saint, an honourable villain!  
O nature, what hadst thou to do in hell,  
When thou didst bower the spirit of fiend  
In mortal paradise of such sweet flesh?  
Was ever book containing such vile matter  
So fairly bound? O, that deceit should dwell  
In such a gorgeous palace!"

But no sooner has she said this, which is surely all right in itself, she immediately strikes out at the nurse for saying almost the same thing.

"Blister'd be thy tongue  
For such a wish! he was not born to shame:  
Upon his brow shame is ashamed to sit;  
For 'tis a throne where honour may be crown'd  
Sole monarch of the universal earth.  
O, what a beast was I to chide at him!"

And when the nurse is checked by this apparent indifference to the murder of her own cousin—"Will you speak well of him that killed your cousin?"—Juliet lashes out at her once more—

"Shall I speak ill of him that is my husband?  
Ah, poor my lord, what tongue shall smooth thy name,  
When I, thy three-hours wife, have mangled it?  
But, wherefore, villain, didst thou kill my cousin?  
That villain cousin would have kill'd my husband:  
Back, foolish tears, back to your native spring;  
Your tributary drops belong to woe,  
Which you, mistaking, offer up to joy,  
My husband lives, that Tybalt would have slain;  
And Tybalt's dead, that would have slain my husband:  
All this is comfort: wherefore weep I then?"

From the dramatic point of view there are very few things in the whole play better than this. In the very same breath she calls her husband a villain and then protests her love for him, beyond anyone in her family and everyone else in the world. She had quick sympathy for sorrow or loss and a sound capacity for affection and

companionship in her own family and among her own friends. She also could make full use of a young wife's privilege to rant against her husband. But all these things seem to find their proper place and do not mar the symmetry of her own life. Even her outbursts of passion which seem wild and even bitter for the moment, nevertheless by a kind of miraculous harmony do not impair the integrity of her heart and the sound judgment of her mind.

And what a colorful person she is with all sorts of interests and capacities for all manner of activity in this work-a-day world! We see how as a married woman, just as earlier in the midst of the balcony scene itself, Juliet had a quick and receptive mind, with a head teeming with ideas and thoughts that flashed back and forth between her and her husband so fast and so strong that her poor husband was sometimes left bewildered. One thing is certain; love with Juliet would never be dull. There was nothing prosaic about her, nor self-righteous, nor self-satisfied. Her fiery passion could be at the same time tender and understanding; but it was never sickeningly sweet and in consequence, the great danger which some pretend to find, namely, that one or both parties after marriage will be surfeited, could not prove true for her. But let me tell you young man and young woman, who have been blessed or cursed with the wise counsel of your elders on affairs of the heart, don't worry so infernally much about the danger of giving too much and finding that both you and your partner are soon fed up with whole business. Even the poets seem to give some color to this wisdom of the second best.

"The reddest lips that ever have kissed,  
The brightest eyes that ever have shone,  
May pray and whisper, and we not list,  
Or look away and never be missed,  
Ere yet ever a month is gone."

Most of the talk about the dangers of expressing one's affection and too much and too close companionship is done by thick-headed male and female morons who are stultified from the ears both ways, and have never been guilty of giving any affection to anybody. Of course you must give your best to the other person, and not be lazy and selfish and give your worst, or whatever happens to be present for the moment. And also, as in every phase of life, there must be respect for human dignity and indeed a fervent defense of and a solicitous protection of the dignity of the other at every turn. But in addition to these qualifications which all civilized people understand without comment, the important thing is to give and keep on giving, for this is the very life and essence of marriage.

When Romeo is banished, and Tybalt slain, Juliet's parents, not unreasonably, want to regain some semblance of order in the house and quiet things down by getting Juliet married to the highly respectable, rich and desira-

ble Count Paris. Juliet has nothing against Count Paris, (although she never was attracted by him), but she surely can't marry him without committing bigamy. Something must be done at once. Friar Lawrence suggests the sleeping potions, to put Juliet away for a few days so that she will seem dead, and Count Paris will let it go at that. This is not a bad solution! It saves Juliet from the crime of bigamy with resulting criminal procedure on that score; it saves the good friar himself from all manner of ecclesiastical difficulties, since he married the couple clandestinely and in defiance of the most approved conduct in such matters; finally, it seemed an excellent device by which the friar could sneak Juliet out of her vault when she was returned to consciousness, and hurry her away in secret and re-unite her with Romeo.

Romeo and his wife could then leave the country and live abroad. With quick practicality—but no sentimental weakness or self-pity of any kind—Juliet sets to work at once to carry out this plan by which she risked her life in taking this strange drug. For all she knew the friar planned to protect himself by killing her. And she did in fact do her part to perfection. But Romeo (as the audience has already been trained to expect) bungles the matter and changes what might have been a delightful comedy into a most gruesome tragedy. He thinks Juliet is dead—and on the face of the matter we can hardly blame him for this—and he proceeds to arrange to die also. But, apart from his plan to die, which to speak frankly, is suicide and a crime, there are two main objections to his procedure: first, he does not like an honest man give some thought and analysis to this suicide business. Hamlet was met with that great temptation and manfully overcame it. "To be or not to be, that is the question." And poor Macbeth, for all his faults, manfully struggled with his plans for murder, and reasoned the thing through clearly and honestly and fought himself through to victory.

"If it were done when 'tis done,  
then 'twere well  
It were done quickly."

But Romeo—and this is perhaps where the man makes his biggest failure and misses his opportunity in the most shocking and stupid way—Romeo, does not see any moral issue in the matter at all! The man has not courage enough even to fight against temptation, let alone overcome it in the end. That is his first great fault as we have noted by analogy to what a worthy pagan would have done, or a keen-minded follower of the scholastic philosophy of Christianity. Romeo, by way of his first great offense, does not even see a moral issue in the situation, but proceeds self-indulgently to pamper himself with reflection on his own woes. It never ever occurs to the man that he could work, that he could fight, that he could expiate

his grief by a life of service and accomplishment. Great lover as he is, it does not even enter his head that he should try to do that which would make him worthy of his love. No, he is disappointed; he can't have his happy life with the girl of his choice, that he had hoped to have; therefore he quits without a struggle, without even knowing that there is anything to struggle about.

His second great offense is that it takes him three scenes and four hundred lines of ever lasting talk even to kill himself. Perhaps some will think, worse than this, he can't even commit suicide in a creditable way, that is, in keeping with the best patterns of that crime. He drinks poison—and it seems to have been a very carefully selected and mildly acting poison which doesn't give him cramps or cause him pain in the process.

But in dying, as in everything else, Juliet was very different from the man she married. She didn't plan her death at all, nor was she guilty of suicide in the sense of either moral or legal liability. When she did kill herself it was to meet an overwhelming difficulty, and it was done on the spur of the moment without any previous reflection whatever. It amounted therefore to what we call temporary insanity or over-powering emotional interference. It did not involve forces predicated upon moral or intellectual action. Her self-destruction amounted to no more than a reflex action.

If someone throws a bomb in a crowd of people, the one toward whom it is directed will push it away so that it may hit another. If he is taken completely by surprise he may do this and so injure another person although he is both a grave and self-sacrificing man. He did not intend injury to the other, and he would gravely suffer the injury himself if he did any reflecting at all. The warding off of the bombing missile is a purely physical reflex, disconnected with any evaluating activity in the brain. To take another case, there was an instance of a wife who caught her foot in the joining of a sidetrack with the main railway track when a train was approaching at full speed. The husband near at hand tried to pull his wife's foot loose or free her in some way, but it was so firmly lodged that both of them together were utterly unable to move. But just a moment before the train crushed them both, the husband was seen to relax his efforts in freeing her foot and give all his attention to holding her in his arms as they died. That second of time would have been sufficient for him to step back and save his own life. Furthermore, he could have done it honorably, since in sober fact it was impossible for him to save her, and he knew this from his own efforts and she knew it also. But if you insist on talking moral values, then in this instant of time, without evaluating the issues, the whole integrity of his life required him to stay with her as a matter of supervening necessity and unquestioning allegiance. It would be farcical as well as

brutal and stupid to say that that man committed suicide. He had no reflection on the issue of saving his life or losing it. It was the integrity of the life itself that acted and that transcended every moral reflection whether right or wrong.

Now it is clear beyond argument that this was true of Juliet. She hears the noise of rescuers, which means the confirmation of her despair, and as always she acts.

"Yea, noise! then I'll be brief,  
O happy dagger! this is thy sheath (stabs herself);  
There rust and let me die."

On the mechanical side it may be important to keep in mind constantly that fully three-fourths of the play occurs after Romeo and Juliet are married. We have sober fact therefore in our support when we think of the drama as one involving marriage and the conduct of marriage itself. But now that we have followed the action of the play through to the end and have both of the lovers safely dead, I am at a loss to make any final comment. And this is not because—Heaven forgive me!—I am disinclined to moralize whenever I get a chance or even—worse still—inclined to strain the evidence to the breaking point in support of my particular view, or in defense of the one to whom I have given my allegiance. This last is not impartial criticism, nor is it an instance of the judicial process in determining the difficulties. I consider the evidence as critically as I can first, and then I try to decide fairly; but after that I am a hopeless partisan, and my allegiance once given, is not withdrawn.

In this instance, Juliet has everything I can give and I reach out in a fumbling way to gain more for the same service. When Romeo says:

"But, soft! what light through yonder window breaks?  
It is the east, and Juliet is the sun."

he tells the truth—though of course he does it rather prosaically, and in a totally inadequate manner! When one thinks of Juliet one thinks of absolute perfection in the realm of this human world, and at the same time that one thinks of perfection even this perfection is the more perfect because it is freed from the curse of anything that brings it out of touch with everyday life and our human needs. For Juliet is young and strong and buoyant, with lots of playfulness and infinite variety in thought and feeling. But at the very same time—and this and everything else within the perfect bounds and perfect freedom of grace and courtesy and the most fastidious punctilio—she is highly in love and boundlessly loyal to that strength of all unions, that most endearing and contradictory of all the contradictions which are found in the strange union, and the even stranger separateness of man and wife—the unity and the diversity of life itself.

If you want to know what it is to meet life bravely and worthily, avoiding nothing; daring everything every

hour, every minute, night and day, all the time—then give your thoughts and understanding to Juliet.

One single thing is perhaps indicative of what we have said. When you have searched the record and exhausted every word that may bear on the kind of girl she is, you can't stop there. You want to prowl around someplace else, in a rather shameless and dishonest way to lug in outside and totally irrelevant evidence in her support. I confess my favorite sin on this score is that speech of Desdemona in Othello, where she tells the nation's senate what she thinks:

"My noble father,  
I do perceive here a divided duty:  
To you I am bound for life and education;  
My life and education both do learn me  
How to respect you; you are the lord of duty  
I am hitherto your daughter: but here's my husband,  
And so much duty as my mother show'd  
To you, preferring you before her father,

So much I challenge that I may profess  
Duty to the Moor my lord."

Others of course will think of different bits of insight and beauty that they would like to steal, beg or borrow to lay at her feet, for Juliet in our human and everyday need seems to give the answer to our difficulties. Not unreasonably, we are baffled by the terrible contradictions—cruelty, stupidity, folly—all around her. And to bring unity and greatness from so much heavy, irrational contradiction seems impossible. And then we spend a few minutes with Juliet, and it is not even difficult. For she does not ask that things be easy; and the contradictions, the impossible negations, do not bother her. But this completeness is not achieved by a cold, ascetic unity within her. Through marriage she seems to have found the key to all the other unities—she is a part of life itself, but free, and laughing, and always trying out new schemes, as a young girl ought to be.

P. S.

---

## Three Pioneers in the Study of Sex

(Continued from page 76)

was spent in retirement in England while he was engaged in revising his monograph on *Moses and Monotheism* which was published shortly before his death.

These three pioneers in the study of sex and marriage have prepared the way for the labors of the present generation of workers. There are now scores of studies of family life among primitive peoples, far more revealing and significant than any available to Westermarck in the early nineties. When Havelock Ellis was searching for materials for his *Psychological Studies of Sex* there were

not yet in existence any inductive psychological or sociological studies in this field. Today, the theories of Freud are being put to the test of rigid scientific investigation, both by his followers and by others.

Much progress has been made. The prospects are promising for the increasingly rapid development of sound and verified knowledge of sex, marriage and the family by workers in biology, cultural anthropology, psychiatry, psychology and sociology. Scientific knowledge is the indispensable basis for constructive action.

## THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON FAMILY RELATIONS

### Advisory Council:

ANNE D. BLITZ, University of Minnesota  
HARRIET S. DAGGETT, Louisiana State University  
ISABEL E. LORD, Brooklyn, New York  
ETHEL R. McDOWELL, Municipal Court of Chicago  
GOEFFREY MAY, Social Security Board  
WAYNE L. MORSE, University of Oregon Law School  
C. RUFUS ROREM, American Hospital Association

MIRIAM VAN WATERS, Women's Reformatory, Framingham, Massachusetts

CHESTER G. VERNIER, Stanford University

CARL C. ZIMMERMAN, Harvard University

Secretary-Treasurer, ERNEST W. BURGESS, University of Chicago

Vice-President, HUNTINGTON CAIRNS, Baltimore, Maryland

President, ADOLF MEYER, Johns Hopkins University

# Index

## SUBJECTS

Association for Family Living, *Evelyn Millis Duvall*, 75  
Award of Merit Presented to Frederick Osborn, 26  
Background Factors in Divorce, *Clarence W. Schroeder*, 71  
College and the Preparation for Marriage and Family Relationships, *J. Stewart Burgess*, 39  
Comprehensive Program of Eugenics and Its Social Implications, *Frederick Osborn*, 33  
Constitution and Officers of the National Conference of Family Relations, 31  
Course in Human Relations at Brooklyn College, *Mary A. Johnson*, 73  
Course in Modern Marriage at the State University of Iowa, *Moses Jung*, 43  
Editorial Comment, 25  
Family and Mental Ill-Health, *L. Guy Brown*, 77  
Family and Marriage in the United States, *From the Encyclical of Pope Pius XII*, 69  
Family in the Machine Age, *Ernest R. Mowrer*, 67  
First Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Family Relations, 30  
From the Conferences, 52, 77  
Future of Family Counselling, *Ruth Brickner, M.D.*, 48  
Happy Family with Sufficient Children to Survive, *Ellsworth Huntington*, 14  
Heredity in Relation to the Family, *Paul Popenoe*, 46  
Hygienic Marriage Law in Illinois, Some Effects of, *B. K. Richardson*, 44  
Marriage Laws, *Albert C. Jacobs*, 4, 77  
Meetings and Events, 59, 83  
Mental Tests and the Marriage Law, *Ira S. Wile, M.D.*, 78  
Need of a White House Conference on the Family, *Sidney E. Goldstein*, 13  
News and Notes, 56, 82  
Place of the Church in Family Counselling, *Oliver M. Butterfield*, 79  
Plan for Successful Marriage, *Pauline Park Wilson*, 8  
Plan for Successful Marriages, *Harriet R. Mowrer*, 47  
Predictive Factors in the Success or Failure of Marriage, *Ernest W. Burgess*, 1  
Preparation for Marriage in the High School Program, *Lawrence K. Frank*, 9  
Program of the Second Annual Meeting, 80  
Second Annual Meeting of the National Conference, *Adolf Meyer, M.D.*, 51  
Stories for Children, 28, 62  
Three Pioneers in the Field of Sex, *Ernest W. Burgess*, 76  
Trends in Family Relationships the World Over, *E. A. Ross*, 77  
Ways of Living, 16  
What a Wife Was Juliet, 87  
Work of the National Conference on Family Relations, *Paul Sayre*, 25, 49  
Work of the National Youth Administration, *Aubrey Williams*, 65

## AUTHORS

Ruth Brickner, M.D., 48  
L. Guy Brown, 77  
Ernest W. Burgess, 1, 76  
J. Stewart Burgess, 39  
Oliver M. Butterfield, 79  
Evelyn Millis Duvall, 75  
Lawrence K. Frank, 9  
Sidney E. Goldstein, 13  
Ellsworth Huntington, 14  
Albert C. Jacobs, 4, 77  
Mary A. Johnson, 73  
Adolf Meyer, M.D., 51  
Ernest R. Mowrer, 67  
Harriet R. Mowrer, 47  
Frederick Osborn, 33  
Pope Pius XII, 69  
Paul Popenoe, 46  
B. K. Richardson, 44  
Paul Sayre, 25, 28, 49, 62, 87  
Clarence W. Schroeder, 71  
Ira S. Wile, M.D., 78  
Aubrey Williams, 65  
Pauline Park Wilson, 8